

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, as we ponder the depths and the heights of Thy love, magnify Thyself in us; help us to serious thought, to spiritual thought, thus renewing the freshness and the joy and the hope of life. When we accept it with its challenge and its obligations, O let our days be full of wholesome endeavor and faithful service, making them fruitful in our land and the whole busy world. Ever keep in our thought that the secret of unity, contentment, and progress is the fear of the Lord, and that happy is that people whose God is the Lord. Father of mercy, forgive our sins and blot them out, not only in Thy book of remembrance but out of our hearts and minds, and bring us at last through joy and through sorrow to Thine own blessed immortality.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3493. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. GREEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JUNE 25, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the Governor of the State of Washington, I have received the certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Third Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Fred Norman.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. MACK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CONTINUING TEMPORARY AUTHORITY OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION UNTIL MARCH 1, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3911) to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph under the head "United States Maritime Commission" in title I of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 521, 79th Cong., approved July 23, 1946), as amended by section 2 of Public Law 6, Eightieth Congress, approved February 26, 1947, and section 1 of said Public Law 6, Eightieth Congress, and the first two sentences of section 11 (a) and section 14 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong., approved March 8, 1946), are amended by striking out the dates "July 1, 1947" and "December 31, 1947" wherever either appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the date "March 1, 1948."

Sec. 2. That section 5 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) Where an operator is engaged both in the foreign trade and in the domestic trade (coastwise or intercoastal), additional charter hire determined with reference to voyage profits of the chartered vessels, under regulations promulgated by the Maritime Commission, shall be computed, accounted for, and paid separately on such foreign trade and shall be computed, accounted for, and paid separately on such domestic trade covering all voyages commencing subsequent to June 30, 1947."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 2, line 15, after the words "domestic trade", insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances, one on the subject of soil conservation and the other on the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his re-

marks in the Record and include a letter he received from the Secretary of War and his reply thereto.

Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Nashua Telegraph of Nashua, N. H.

AID TO EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, doubtless the Russian sympathizers in America will be pleased to read in the newspapers that the Russian Government has about been persuaded to sit down around the table with France and England in a cooperative spirit to see how much money, material, equipment, and food it will take to relieve the needs of these and other European countries to be furnished by the United States under what is now known as the Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember a few weeks ago Secretary of State Marshall in a speech made a statement in substance that unless the European nations got together, including Russia, and decided how much help they needed from the United States and how much they were willing to help themselves, the United States in the future would help only the nations that were friendly to our form of government and who would try to help themselves in reestablishing a government subject to the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we thought at the time this statement was made that Russia should be excluded. After 2 years of her attempt to scuttle every peace and economic move in the interest of the European countries and after her constant opposition to every proposal by the United States Government, we should have learned our lesson by this time and should not have left the door open for Russia to come in on any future give-away policy of the United States. It appears that the Russian leaders who have no conscience can be greatly benefited by joining for a few weeks with France and England in parceling out how many billions of dollars and materials those countries are willing to accept, particularly Russia. It appears that Russia intends to come in. Why not? She got billions during the war, and she hopes to get more billions at the expense of the United States, which she hopes will wreck our own economy making our Nation an easy prey to her ideology of government—communism.

Mr. Speaker, while we are sending \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey and have vowed to stop communism within the Russian border, yet it appears we are willing to continue to help finance the Russian Government if her leaders will only be so cooperative and kind enough to sit in on the conference and let us know how much they want.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been far better for the United States, in my judgment, to have not left the doors ajar for the entrance of Russia.

It is my judgment that before we ask the nations of the world to let us know how much more they need that we would have first adopted the Hoover, Baruch, Vandenberg plan making a study of our ability to further help European nations before we hold out the hope that all they have to do is to add up the amounts in the billions of dollars in help they and other nations need. President Truman said:

It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

Of course, this was aimed at Russia. Now we invite her in to accept our help. In a later speech he declared that "the United States would limit its economic aid to nations which do not seek to impose their will on others." Has Russia quit seeking to impose her will on others? Is the President riding two horses at the same time going in different directions?

Mr. Speaker, since these utterances were made Russia's imperialistic career has gone unchanged. Our Government has recently issued a strong protest against the Communist coup in Hungary and against the suppression of the last remnants of the Communist opposition in Bulgaria.

Yet, in the face of all this, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says:

Secretary Marshall has announced an American-financed plan for the recovery of Europe with Russia included as a recipient of the funds.

The Post goes on to say:

It is confusing to hear Russia arraigned one day as an aggressor and to see her included the next day with democratic nations as one of the beneficiaries of American loans which may total some \$24,000,000,000.

This in the face of Russia denouncing our loans to Europe as "dollar imperialism" and an attempt to enmesh Europe in the web of American finance capitalism.

If we are going to try to help build up a democracy in western Europe in opposition to Communist imperialism, why, in the name of heaven, do we invite Russia to sit in with other nations who are willing to work with us and thereby giving to her vast aid in American dollars pulled out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of America?

Mr. Speaker, it does appear that this administration has practiced the policy of wasting the finances of this country by appeasing Russia until we cannot break with her long-practiced tradition.

TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the Subcommittee on Pay and Administration of the Armed Services Committee will begin hearings on the cashing of terminal-leave

bonds on Thursday of this week. I know this will be of interest to many Members of Congress.

I would like at this time to invite any Member of Congress who introduced a bill on this subject to appear before the subcommittee this Thursday, if he so desires, to give the committee the benefit of his views. Of necessity, any such statement must be short.

Should a Member desire to file a statement upon the bill for the record, naturally he may do so.

The terminal-leave bonds, or technically the armed forces leave bonds, are part of the national debt. We propose to reduce that debt by cashing these bonds and, at the same time, save the Government interest charges.

The total value of the armed forces leave bonds outstanding as of June 13, 1947, was approximately \$1,820,000,000. There were about 8,500,000 bonds outstanding.

It is estimated that within a year about 12,000,000 bonds, with a total value of about \$2,500,000,000, would be outstanding if the pending legislation to permit cashing is not enacted. That amount of bonds, at 2½-percent interest, would cost the Government \$62,500,000 a year in interest alone.

Our subcommittee intends to act expeditiously. I have made this announcement of public hearings so that Members of Congress, and others, may make arrangements to be heard.

FIGHT FOR HOUSING DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, representatives of a veritable who's who of nationally distinguished civic, religious, fraternal, and veterans' associations are here today in the interests of housing on Fight for Housing Day.

It is announced that we are to have an investigation of building-construction labor this summer to see if it is the cause of the national housing shortage. No exception can be taken to such an investigation, but it is a fraction of the job, for builders who sell shoddy houses, material suppliers who continue to control housing markets, and municipalities with antiquated handicraft, cost-boosting municipal building codes are also causes of the national housing shortage. The House will, I am sure, not consciously look for a scapegoat or engage in partiality. An even-handed investigation of the national housing shortage by a select committee appointed by the Speaker, as called for by House Resolution 247, introduced by me June 16, 1947, is absolutely essential in the national interest. Such an investigation, together with immediate action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, introduced in the House as H. R. 2523, will show that we are really tackling the housing shortage. It is my earnest hope that we will be trying in the next 6 months to find out what it takes to get homes built, and that we

will not permit ourselves to be diverted from that task by looking for someone to blame for the national housing emergency.

The organizations participating in Fight for Housing Day are the following: American Association of Social Workers.

American Association of University Women.

American Council on Education.

American Council on Race Relations.

American Federation of Labor.

American Federation of Women's Clubs.

American Home Economics Association.

American Public Health Association.

American Public Welfare Association.

American Veterans' Committee.

American Veterans of World War II.

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Consumers Clearing House.

Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America.

Family Service Association of America.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Jewish Welfare Board.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Association of Consumers.

National Association of Housing Officials.

National Association of Rural Housing.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.

National Catholic Welfare Council.

National Conference of Catholic Charities.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

National Council of Catholic Men.

National Council of Catholic Women.

National Council of Housing Associations.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Council of Negro Women.

National Farmers Union.

National Federation of Settlements.

National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

National League of Women Voters.

National Public Housing Conference.

National Urban League.

National Women's Trade Union League.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

United States Conference of Mayors.

Veterans of Foreign Wars.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and especially to his statement that the investigation regarding racketeering and monopoly in building construction should be carried on in an impartial

manner. He probably read the same press notice that I saw the other morning which mentioned that the subcommittee, composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS], were going to investigate union racketeering in building construction. When we prepared the report of the subcommittee with reference to the investigation there was no such reference contained therein. It was stated that the investigation would be with respect to monopoly and racketeering in building construction, without differentiating between business and labor unions. We intend to make an impartial investigation covering every phase of such activity and to uncover such monopoly whether it is in business, labor, or in certain improper codes of municipalities. Something has to be done to remedy the situation which now exists concerning the construction of homes and other buildings throughout the Nation. I sincerely hope that this investigation will be helpful and that it will bring forth the fact that the construction can be accomplished without the passing of drastic legislation which will result in Federal control of such construction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MALONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan in today's Tribune.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

STRIKE IN COAL FIELDS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the strike news from the coal fields today is very distressing and from the morning papers there is every indication that the strikes are spreading in an alarming degree. A general strike at this time would be the greatest disaster that could happen to our country.

We have now had time to appraise the President's veto message. No message from any President has ever received such universal disapproval. As I read the message again, I find sufficient grounds to come to the conclusion that it constitutes an indirect invitation to all labor to go on strike. The President alone will have to bear this responsibility.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

GENERAL STATE OF CONFUSION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I become so confused nowadays over what is happening. I just do not know how the general public feel about many things that happen daily. When I think of the destruction of 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes by pouring kerosene on them, the terrible destruction of food by instruction of the Department of Agriculture—remember this Department of Government once killed the pigs, plowed down the cotton, and burned the wheat—and then when I think about importing 4,000,000 bushels of potatoes from Canada when Great Britain has a potato famine. I just do not see where there is any sense in things of that kind. Why did not Canada give her potatoes to her mother country? We did not need to buy them at high prices.

Then, I read in this morning's paper about food packages from Greece coming into this country. There are 100,000 to 160,000 packages of food representing such delicacies as figs, olives, grapes, and raisins. That is food for the Greeks. Now, why should the Greeks send food here to America? I cannot understand that, when we are requested by the President to give \$300,000,000 to feed the Greeks.

There are so many things that just do not make sense—things that somebody ought to find out and see what the trouble is. I have tried to find out but I cannot.

The Congress overwhelmingly passes a labor law for the good of labor, for the general public, and for management. The President sends a scathing rebuke to Congress with a veto, saying there is not a good thing in the bill, or at least he mentioned none.

Congress passed a tax bill. The President vetoed it, saying he wants to apply the taxes on the great national debt his party built up for this Nation. Why does not the President try in some manner to cut down his awful spending? Oh, such spending—no economy in government. No wonder we are confused.

The remedy: elect a Republican President next year to work with the Republican Congress. Then it will be cooperation—until then I see nothing but confusion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include an editorial in each by Stewart Riley, publisher of the Bedford Daily Times-Mail.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, news reports indicate that General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, advised a Senate appropriations subcommittee yesterday that he will have to reduce his personnel by 15,000 under the appropriation bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee and passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been hammering away to prevent the slash in the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. I have pointed out on this floor how severely the all-important hospital program would be affected.

Last week when the appropriation bill involving the Veterans' Administration was before the House I offered an amendment to increase it by \$100,000,000 and my amendment was voted down and I was astounded to see members of the Appropriations Committee of the House in both parties take the floor in opposition to it. Those who opposed my move at that time contended that the Veterans' Administration had been given all the money it had asked for. I cannot understand how they can reconcile that position with General Bradley's statement which I understand he gave before the Senate committee. The House conferees can still rectify this matter and I appeal to them to place back in this bill an appropriation sufficient for General Bradley and General Hawley to carry on effectively and efficiently the work of the Veterans' Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain articles.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. PRICE of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech by Gen. George C. Kenny at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the unification of the armed forces.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made by Mr. Michael W. Straus, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, and an address by Dr. Charles A. Lory, former president of the Colorado A. and M. College.

LET'S DEVELOP AMERICA'S INTERNAL RESOURCES, AND STRENGTHEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE BY THE IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include excerpts from the hearings by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and from the report of the Board of Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Congress is going somewhat wild in curtailing our internal improvements while pouring American money into the coffers of Europe.

If there ever was a time when we needed to concentrate on the development of our internal resources, that time is now.

One thing I am going to insist on in the coming appropriation bill is funds with which the Army engineers may proceed with the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

The Mississippi River, the greatest inland waterway on earth, is virtually a dead stream, because, while traffic can go down it with ease and rapidity, it cannot return, except at terrific expense.

Our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., is bottled up. In order to bring the raw materials for this plant by water you have to go upstream 1,131 miles to reach a point that could be reached by moving up on this slack water route only 481 miles.

This project is vitally necessary to the national defense, as well as to the navigation of the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Tennessee, and all their tributaries.

We must get the work started on it as quickly as possible.

It is already authorized by law. All we have to do now is to make the necessary appropriation. We cannot afford to postpone this proposition.

Every year's delay will add to our transportation costs, if not to the cost of construction, and at the same time weaken our national defense by failing to provide this short water route between the Gulf of Mexico and our atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge—the greatest defense plant the world has ever known.

Those of you who want to spend the American people's money to feed and clothe every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu and to finance regimes that are now plotting the overthrow of this Government may do so, but I, for one, will insist on the development of our own internal resources; and this, the greatest project of its kind ever proposed, should be the first on the list.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have read with considerable personal regret that General Eisenhower is to leave his post as Chief of Staff to become president of Columbia Univer-

sity. I recall a few words which General Eisenhower spoke to the Committee on Appropriations at the conclusion of the War Department hearings this year which were said off the record. I have thought of them many times and I think they should be in the record somewhere as a part of the written record on which history may judge the character of General Eisenhower in his service to the Government. I recall that he said something like this:

"We have presented to you our request for the funds that we think we need. This is the best judgment of the War Department at this time, but I want to say to you that the War Department recognizes the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress. When we have completed the presentations and the Congress has made its deliberate judgment on the portion of the national income that can be devoted to the mission of the Army, the War Department will live with the decision that the Congress has made; there will be no recriminations and no complaints. If I hear of anyone acting or speaking to the contrary there will be another in his place when it comes to my attention. I believe in the American system."

To me that was one of the finest expressions I have heard from any representative of any branch of Government appearing before the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

UNITED STATES HOME NEEDS VERSUS FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the thought suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi that if we are to help other nations we here at home must preserve our own economy, keep a firm foundation under our own industries, agriculture, and economic structure, when now advanced in the Halls of Congress does not meet quite as much criticism as it did in days gone by, days when anybody venturing to speak for America first and in the interests of American national interests was branded by the Reds and by some New Dealers as a seditionist, if not as a traitor. Yes, times have changed and today it is all right to give the Communists a kick and to, if not too loudly, say something about the necessity of keeping our Nation strong and ready.

Today in the gallery, from my own district, sit substantial citizens who are down here protesting the cut in the agriculture bill. They say that the farm lands up there and the farmers need that appropriation to preserve the fertility of the soil, and they want to know why I should not go all out for increased appropriations. I tried to explain to them that there just was not money enough to go around, but I did not get it across. They do not like any cut—anything other than an increase in the appropriation.

They think I ought to vote for it, and maybe I should. Another group sits with them, and we all had lunch together this noon, which wants money for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. When I told them that yesterday, for example, we put through legislation to spend some \$34,000,000 to sing songs, and make speeches, show works of art to exchange pupils and teachers with foreign nations I just did not get anywhere. They wanted less of that, more for the home folks. Unless something is done those friends of mine may vote against me next time because I do not vote for the things they want, and I do not like that. I am wondering if some of you gentlemen are going to get into the same situation—that is, find yourselves without an office and without a salary if you do not quit giving everything away to somebody across the seas while failing to take care of the home folks. Now, help me out by limiting the grants of money for people in other countries until we have taken care of the essential needs of ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address recently made by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 253.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 253 makes in order, under an open rule, consideration of H. R. 3830, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and reported by the Committee on the Armed Services. This bill, H. R. 3830, provides for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

I do not expect to take the time of the House to discuss this measure in detail, because, very frankly, it is a complicated bill. If I may speak facetiously, I have been told this morning it is the longest "Short" bill on record, inasmuch as it was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has every reason to feel happy and facetious, because only this morning, after hearings for 3 days, the committee of which the gentleman is a member, and of which I am a member, without hearing any witnesses, unanimously adopted this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts for calling that committee report to the attention of the House and for the splendid support he gave my bill, H. R. 775, this morning. I express the hope that the same unanimous support may be given the measure when it comes to the floor of the House.

Returning to the discussion of H. R. 3830, very simply this bill sets up a method whereby officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps may be reduced in rank to fit the permanent peacetime organization of our armed services and to fix a method whereby promotions shall be made in the future. The rule which has been granted, I may add, was by a unanimous vote. It provides for 4 hours of general debate. It was the opinion of the Rules Committee, and of members of the Armed Services Committee which appeared before the Rules Committee, that the 4 hours' time granted under the rule will not be required for the consideration of this legislation. However, in order that there be no shutting off of debate, in order that any Member of the House may have a full opportunity to ask any questions relative to this bill he sees fit, because, as I said before, it is a complicated measure, the Rules Committee believed that 4 hours' general debate should be permitted, but expresses the fervent hope it will not be necessary to take the entire 4 hours.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. As the gentleman from Ohio has said, the rule provides for 4 hours' general debate, but it was the opinion of the Committee on Rules that probably that amount of time would not be needed. It is a very comprehensive and incompressible bill, and we hope that the Armed Services Committee will explain its contents fully to the House, and to that end

I yield back the balance of my time so that the rule may be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STIMULATE ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"That effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this Act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than seventeen years of age for periods of two, three, four, five, or six years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of three, four, five, or six years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time may submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within three months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of two years of overseas service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until two years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress,

or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed six months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of eighteen years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardian of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed three months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge.

"Sec. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than four months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

"Sec. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

"Sec. 4. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: *Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of \$50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

"Sec. 5. Effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are likewise repealed.

"Sec. 6. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V., 691a) is amended by striking out the word 'and' at the end of subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following 'and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after

the approval of the Act adding this subsection."

"Sec. 7. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words 'eighteen' therefrom and substituting therefor the words 'seventeen' in each of the said sections."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
DEWEY SHORT,
CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendment, namely:

The Senate amendment was to strike out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and to insert thereafter the provisions of the Senate bill. The managers on the part of the House receded from disagreement to the Senate amendment, with an amendment whereby section 3 of the bill as passed by the House and stricken by the Senate was reinstated. In accepting the Senate amendment, the managers on the part of the House thereby concurred also in the addition of a new section to the bill whereby mustering-out payments are denied to persons entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the enactment of the bill.

WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE ARENDS,
CARL VINSON,
PATRICK DREWRY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas reserved all points of order on the bill.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the

Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3830, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 47 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning I wish to express my genuine and sincere appreciation to each and every member of our subcommittee and also to the members of the full Committee on Armed Services of the House for their full and earnest cooperation in the preparation and the reporting of this very long, difficult, and involved measure.

At first it seemed an almost impossible task because the subject is just about as interesting as a table of logarithms or a page out of a trigonometry textbook. It required only a week's or a month's time to find out what one of my professors of philosophy once said: That a philosopher or a scientist is one who makes the obvious seem obscure.

After 10 long weeks of hearings on this complicated measure, I confess that even members of the subcommittee who have studied it most diligently in long and exhaustive hearings and after many executive sessions and even after private discussions with representatives of the War and Navy Departments may not have the final answer to the solution of this pressing problem. On the whole, however, I think we have done a very good job, and for the first time, perhaps, in our history we have brought the Army and the Navy together so that they are in fundamental agreement, not only the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy but our high-ranking officers in both arms of the services.

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1 on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services has been working since the 1st of April on the Army and Navy promotion bills, which are now together in H. R. 3830.

The hearings have been well attended, and we have been through one of the most difficult, complicated subjects I have had to work on since coming to Congress. It was only a week ago last Monday that we completed our work on these bills. H. R. 3830 now represents our view as to an equitable and economical promotion system for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Corps—a system that will offer careers satisfactory enough to attract capable men and to hold such men now in service. The bill was unanimously reported by our full committee last Friday.

The Navy promotion system is contained in the first four titles of H. R. 3830. The Army promotion system is in title 5. Both systems are predicated upon the principle of promotion by selection, although they differ considerably in applying the principle.

When we began studying the bills, we were inclined to integrate the two promotion systems. Early in the hearings,

however, we became aware of the fact that it is too early to effect such a radical departure, even though I think I represent the view of the subcommittee in saying that within the next 5 to 10 years the systems can be reconciled to a much greater extent than they can be now.

The Navy plan in titles 1 through 4 of H. R. 3830 is not an innovation for the Navy. It effects certain refinements in the Navy selection system which has been in effect since 1916—over 30 years. The reason the Navy resubmits the program to Congress at this time is to permit an immediate return to the Navy system of permanent promotion by selection, with provision for temporary ranks during the period required for the transition from the present wartime system. The Navy makes certain changes required by the recent integration of Reserve officers to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and incorporates various improvements in the selection system based on wartime experience. The new Navy promotion law is the product of more than 2 years' intensive study by various boards of officers in the Navy Department.

The Army promotion system, contained in title 5 of H. R. 3830, is, on the other hand, a real novelty for the Army. It represents over 8 months' study by a special War Department board, including a thorough analysis of the Navy system. The result is that, for the first time, supported by strong recommendations of General Eisenhower, the Army is to have promotion by selection in the lower Army grades. Selection has always been used by the Army for promotion to grades above colonel. But always in the past, in the lower grades, seniority alone controlled Army promotions. The subcommittee was strongly in favor of this change.

Let me say here that beyond using the same word—selection—the Army and Navy promotion systems, as outlined in this bill, correspond very little at the present time in governing promotions up to and including the grades of lieutenant colonel and commander. Actually, the Army selection system as proposed in title 5 of this bill is, in the lower grades, an elimination system, so that all qualified officers will be selected up and only the unqualified will go out, rather than selecting only the best qualified officers up, as is the case in the Navy system, to fill a limited number of vacancies. There are excellent reasons for this difference in approach by the services, only one of which I will mention at this time—that is, that the introduction of selection into the Army is so novel an undertaking, with such far-reaching effects on the careers of tens of thousands of officers who have grown up under a seniority system in use throughout the Army's history, the Army of necessity must enter into this undertaking with caution. As a result, and because of other basic differences between the services at the present time, the Army selection, in grades below colonel, will operate initially as a method by which to force out incompetent officers. On the other hand, the Navy system, beginning in the grade of lieutenant commander, will force out about one of every five officers in each grade when

the system stabilizes, in order to preserve the required distribution of officers and to maintain the proper age levels in each grade.

It is important to keep in mind that both services, in many respects, are still under wartime conditions, especially in regard to personnel requirements. Take the Navy promotion system, for example. Title 1 sets up the permanent promotion plant for Navy line officers and for the Marines. Title 2 does the same thing, using the Navy running-mate system, for the Navy staff corps. But title 3 deals with temporary promotions, which will have to be continued in the Navy for a considerable time to come. By applying Regular Navy officer percentage to the temporary strength of the Navy, these promotions will be continued on a closely defined basis until they are no longer needed. Under the terms of the bill they will pass out of the picture not later than 10 years hence.

In the Army a comparable situation exists. Section 515 of title 5 of the Army bill continues Army temporary promotions so long as they are necessary in that service. Bear in mind that Army Regular officer strength will reach only about 37,500 officers this year; nevertheless, the Army officer active duty strength will be well over 100,000. In the Navy not more than 27,000 Regulars are represented in its more than 40,000 officers.

So you can see that what is being done by these bills is to provide a permanent career plan for those in the Regular Army and Regular Navy while at the same time providing for the carrying along of many thousands of temporary officers for some years ahead. One result of this situation is that it is premature for any of us to say that the programs contained in H. R. 3830 will finally answer the promotional needs of the services. Some 5 or 10 years hence we will know better what, in detail, those needs will be. For the present, however, the programs offer needed stability to the Regulars; they permit personnel planning in both services to proceed efficiently; and they provide a means by which to meet the temporary officer requirements of all the services.

Various important changes in old promotion law are effected by this legislation. I will summarize them, then explain those changes the committee made in the programs as proposed by the services. I will take the Navy program first—titles 1 through 4 of H. R. 3830.

First, Navy permanent promotions are reintroduced. They have been discontinued since 1942. The committee quickly recognized the urgent need of this, in order to provide some incentive for Regular Navy officers to remain in service and to offer some inducement to capable men to make the service a career. This is one of the main reasons why this legislation is before the Congress at this time.

The Navy plan brings officers to flag rank at an earlier age than heretofore. By normal promotion, a Navy officer may now reach admiral rank at about age 53, and outstanding officers can reach admiral grade still earlier. Under previous

law, they could reach this rank as old as 60. This is a great improvement, in the view of the committee. The last war certainly demonstrated the need for vigor and comparative youth in positions of responsibility in the services.

Also, the Navy plan, for the first time, introduces selection in admiral grade—that is, from now on an admiral must justify himself after a certain length of time, instead of being guaranteed retention in grade until he reaches retirement age or resigns or dies in office. This should have a stimulating effect in the Navy's highest ranks.

Grade distributions—that is, the numbers of officers in each grade—were increased to some extent in lieutenant commander, commander, and captain grades, while the numbers in ensign and lieutenant grades were reduced. There are two reasons for this: First, under old law the forced elimination of officers has been too severe in the higher grades to insure a reasonably attractive career; second, modern war has become so complex that additional officers are needed now in higher grades to perform the many highly technical, professional duties which formerly did not exist. After extensive consideration of this departure, the committee agreed as to its desirability.

Another novelty in the Navy program is the so-called accelerated promotion plan which permits the Navy, for the first time, to promote especially well qualified officers in advance of the average officer. This has been impossible in the past because, under the Navy system, every man ranking above the promoted officer was, under the law, considered as having failed of selection. This had most serious effects upon the officers passed over by the selection board. It jeopardized their entire Navy careers, because, if they failed once again for selection to the same grade, they had to be forced out of the Navy. The natural result was that such promotions simply were not made. Now such promotions become possible by the accelerated promotion device, which permits a Navy selection board to select an outstanding man without having to pass over every officer above him.

A new promotion zone plan is contained in the Navy program. This is a complicated process, but the general idea is to prevent a great amount of forced elimination of officers one year, practically none the next, maybe 50-percent elimination the next, and so on, as has been the rule in the past. By averaging the vacancies to occur over a 5-year period, and by applying to that average the average number of officers who will come up for promotion during that period, the Navy can insure that all officers will have comparatively equal opportunity for promotion over the years. This should be a substantial improvement over the old system. The Navy is proud of the idea and the committee thinks it has reason to be.

Another innovation is the introduction of limited duty officers into the Navy officer corps. These officers are to come from enlisted and warrant officer ranks only. This program gives

the Navy enlisted man an opportunity to advance to officer grade as a member of a restricted group. He can rise as high as commander and is given a protected career along the way. Even though this group cannot be as large as some of us might have preferred, because it must be restricted to the specialized jobs such technicians can perform, the committee was pleased that this proposal was made and that Navy enlisted men are to have a reasonable opportunity to advance into the officer corps.

These are the main differences proposed by the Navy plan.

Now, as to the Army plan, contained in title 5, the big item is the introduction of promotion by selection in the lower Army grades, beginning in the grade of lieutenant, the same rank as that in which the Navy begins selection.

Promotions on a basis of seniority alone are dispensed with by this system. In the future, an Army officer will have to qualify for promotion—that is, he must be selected for promotion by the majority of a board of officers—before he can advance to captain and above. Provision is made for promotion without regard to existing vacancies after specified periods of service in grade—this being a marked difference from the Navy system required by the fact that the Army functions as a nucleus or cadre in peacetime for the enormous wartime Army, whereas the Navy remains, in peace or war, largely an operational force.

The Army plan sets up various promotion lists rather than using the Navy running-mate idea. The result is about the same; that is, it is so designed as to give comparative promotion opportunity to officers regardless of the branch they may be serving in. Also, the Army bill had to have a separate promotion list for the Air Corps in anticipation of the creation of a separate Department of Air, as contemplated under the merger bill. The committee went over this aspect of the plan very carefully and agreed that it is workable and, at least for the present, a necessary Army procedure.

The Army also plans, for the first time, to stop appointing officers in each of the several branches, excepting the Air Corps, the several Corps of the Medical Department and chaplains. Army officers in the future are to be appointed in the Regular Army rather than in the Infantry, for example. This particular phase of the Army plan was taken under special study by the committee because of the Corps of Engineers and Judge Advocate General Department problems associated therewith. Brigadier General Dahlquist, the Army representative charged with this legislation for the War Department, was called upon several times to justify this procedure. After full consideration in public hearings and executive session, the subcommittee concluded that the Army is sound in its contention that branch appointments, with the exceptions mentioned, should be discontinued. Continuation of branch appointments, while providing protection for the branches and insuring continuation of the traditions of the various

branches and corps, nevertheless is subject to the greater disadvantage of imposing upon the Army too rigid a structure which cannot be readily responsive to changing military needs.

This innovation in the Army bill does not abolish Army branches. It merely stops commissioning officers in the various branches, thereby permitting the Secretary of War to transfer officers with greater facility from one branch to another as military needs dictate. This had to be done on a grandiose scale during the war.

Another change is that the Army will now appoint chiefs of branches from among those officers who are already generals, rather than following the old system of requiring that branch chiefs hold rank of the office only temporarily. This was approved by the committee, but with certain modifications I will discuss later.

The Army plan will result in the promotion of all but the unfit officers to and including the grade of lieutenant colonel thereafter, only best-qualified officers will be promoted to fill vacancies, comparable in this respect to the Navy plan. The committee anticipates that this plan will be modified when the Army gains experience in the application of selection in the lower grades, and that before too many years have gone by forced elimination in lower Army grades will have to be imposed. This is now possible—but not required—in the Army plan. For the present, however, there is little question that the Army's venture into selection is too radical a departure to attempt the immediate adoption of a system identical with that of the Navy. In this connection the Navy testified that its present system could not have been adopted by the Navy itself when it was first applied in 1916. Such a system has to develop gradually. No doubt the Army plan will evolve similarly, as modified by needs peculiar to the Army.

A further Army novelty is the ranking of Army brigadier generals with rear admirals of the lower half and major generals with rear admirals of the upper half. Heretofore, in the absence of one-star grade in the Navy, rank discrepancies occurred which the subcommittee agreed are undesirable. The Army bill requires that date of rank in the one- and two-star ranks will determine the relative rank; not the one or two stars worn on the officers' shoulders. This avoids the rear-admiral versus brigadier-general problem which has existed formerly. We not only agreed with the proposal, but required its extension to Marine brigadier generals and major generals.

At this point I may say that the only alternative to the plan of ranking brigadiers with rear admirals is the permanent reestablishment of the rank of commodore in the Navy, which is vigorously opposed by Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Nimitz, and others in policy-making positions in the Navy Department. The subcommittee determined this point after a great deal of discussion. Since the Army entered no opposition to the removal of commodores from the Navy rank structure, and since the relative

rank of brigadier generals and rear admirals has been adjusted, the subcommittee could see no justifiable reason for imposing commodores on the Navy. A decision to this effect was reached unanimously, with all members of the subcommittee present.

One further point on both bills before going into the committee amendments: I am glad to say that neither of the plans contained in H. R. 3830 will involve additional expense to the Government after enactment until the services reach their authorized strengths some 10 or 15 years hence. At that time some additional cost will occur. But this will decrease rapidly until, comparatively soon thereafter, the Navy system will function with a saving to the Government. The Army system, over a 30-year span, might cost three-tenths of 1 percent more than the present system. The committee found this an especially attractive feature of both plans, particularly in view of the promotional improvements that the bill will effect.

Now, as to our amendments to the original proposals: Our most important changes were in flag and general ranks in the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps. As the promotion programs came to us originally, they were based on the idea of keeping five-star rank in peacetime. Together, the bills authorized 24 four-star officers, 79 three-star officers, 406 two-star officers, and 237 brigadier generals. These are combined figures—for the Army—including the Air Corps—the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Separately, the original bills authorized 15 full generals for the Army, plus the Chief of Staff; 46 lieutenant generals, 142 major generals, and 203 brigadier generals. For the Navy 8 full admirals, plus the Chief of Naval Operations; 29 vice admirals, and 253 rear admirals. For the Marine Corps 1 full general, 4 lieutenant generals, 11 major generals, and 34 brigadier generals.

We considered this question of top rank as exceedingly important. We held consultations with the Secretaries of War and Navy and with the professional heads of all the services before we reached any final decisions.

Our unanimous conclusion was that five-star rank is properly a wartime rank and should not become a continuing peacetime rank. We also agreed that in peacetime the services should not have as many high-ranking officers as they had asked for, although, in reducing those now holding high rank, an appropriate period for readjustment should be provided. The result was that we chose July 1, 1948, as the date on which four stars will become the top peacetime rank in all the services, and numerical ceilings, effective on that date, were imposed on the three- and four-star officers the services can have. If all five-star officers are not off active duty by then, they will be charged against the four-star allotments of the services.

As amended, the bill now provides that effective July 1 of next year, the Army cannot have more than 4 four-star generals, as contrasted with the 15, including the Air Forces, the Army bill would have authorized originally. One

of these 4 must be the Chief of Staff of the Army who was excluded from the 15 originally requested. In the Navy, there will be 4 four-star admirals authorized as of July 1, 1948, instead of the originally requested 8 plus the Chief of Naval Operations and Commandant of the Marine Corps. These 4 in the Navy will be the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

You will note that we did not specify all four of the Army four-star officers—only the Chief of Staff of the Army. We left the other three unspecified because at least two of them will have to be occupational chiefs in Europe and Japan. We considered it inadvisable to specify them in the law for the reason that these positions will terminate when the Army's occupational duties are completed. However, there is little doubt that the Army's four-star generals will be the Chief of Staff, the commanding generals of our occupational forces in Japan and Europe, and the commanding general of all Army forces in the United States.

For the Air Forces, we authorized three four-star generals instead of the six originally planned for. Only the commanding general of the Air Corps is designated in the bill. But there is little doubt that one of the other two will be the commanding general of the Strategic Air Forces. The remaining one can be such officer as the commanding general of the Materiel Command, or the commanding general of the Air Defense Command, as the Air Forces may determine.

Also on four-star rank, we amended the bill to require that in the future any officer, whether from the Army, Navy, Air Corps, or the Marine Corps, who becomes Chief of Staff to the President—the position now held by Admiral Leahy—will have four-star rank while he holds that position. We also provided a supplemental allowance for the chiefs of the four services in recognition of their added obligations as compared with other four-star officers.

As to three-star ranks, we authorized the Army, less the Air Corps, to have 23 in place of the 46, including the Air Forces, the bill would have authorized originally. The Navy was also authorized 23 in place of the 29 requested. The marines got 2 instead of 4, and the Air Corps was given 14 rather than the 17 it would otherwise have had. This makes a total of 62 three-star officers as compared with 79 the bills would have authorized as introduced.

Within the three-star limits we required that the services' representatives to the United Nations hold three-star rank and, because of the duties of this assignment, we gave such officers additional allowances while they so serve.

At this point we also instructed the services to allot the same rank for comparable branch chief positions, although these positions were not specified in the bill for the reason that they relate to the organization of the departments rather than to promotions. We have been advised by Admiral Sprague and by General Dahlquist, who are charged with this legislation for the departments,

that the Army and Navy are now in full agreement on the rank for these respective positions. This is an important point. The lack of uniformity of rank in branch chief positions between the services has produced a great deal of unnecessary and unhealthful friction in the past.

On two-star ranks, our decision was to impose numerical ceilings only on permanent promotions and to permit temporary promotions to these ranks to continue so long as temporary promotions remain necessary in both services. This was necessary because all services are still much larger than their permanent officer strengths. To have imposed numerical ceilings on these ranks, proportionate to the services' regular officer strengths, would have produced an impossible situation. In the Army, for instance, the Regular strength, as stated earlier in these remarks, is only 37,500 officers; yet, the total officer strength of the Army, including temporary officers, is well over 100,000—almost four times the Regular strength.

A similar situation exists in the Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps.

As a result, the ceilings imposed on two- and one-star ranks apply only to permanent appointments in these grades. The temporary strengths in these grades will, in the Army, be about 450, and, in the Navy, about 260 rear admirals. These figures will automatically decrease as the Army and Navy reduce in strength over the years ahead.

For permanent promotions, we specified that the Army, including the Air Corps, could have not more than 134 major generals, excluding those temporarily in higher grades. This includes 2 for the Army Dental Corps, 1 Army chaplain, and 8 for the Medical Corps. Of the 179 Army brigadier generals authorized, 2 will be Dental Corps, 1 Veterinary Corps, 1 chaplain, and 8 Medical Corps. The Air Forces will have a proportionate share of the Army allotment in these grades. Present plans are that the Air Corps will have 58 major generals and 75 brigadiers. The Marine Corps will have 10 major generals and 23 brigadiers.

The Navy was authorized 181 rear admirals, and we required that 143 of these be line rear admirals and 38 staff corps rear admirals. Those in the Staff Corps will be made up of 15 in the Medical Corps, 13 in the Supply Corps, 4 in the Civil Engineer Corps, 4 in the Dental Corps, and 2 in the Chaplain Corps. The Navy, of course, will have no one-star rank, although those who are now commodores will retain the rank so long as the grade is needed, subject to the termination of the wartime temporary law under which commodores are appointed.

These ceilings on top rank were arrived at after exceedingly thorough study of lists of the billets the services planned for general and admiral grades. I may say that the committee was reluctant to require these reductions when many of the officers who will be affected so recently gave us the leadership that won the last war. But a large proportion of the lower ranking officers have already been reduced in rank, and the

committee agreed that what has been necessary in their instance must apply comparably to those who served in the topmost grades.

Without getting into as much detail, I will summarize now the other amendments we made in both bills.

We required that the three- and four-star officers be confirmed by the Senate—a definite departure from previous law and not originally contained in either promotion plan.

We placed a limit on the Army's authority to keep brigadier generals and major generals on duty until retirement age after completion of the required service, the limit being 10 brigadiers and 10 major generals who may be so retained. The limit was imposed to insure a constant turn-over in top rank so as to keep youth at the top and to give lower-ranking officers reasonable opportunity to reach general officer grade.

The Army program was amended to permit generals and lieutenant generals to retire in those grades, without extra pay, when so authorized by the President. This was in the Navy proposal; it was extended to the Army to bring the services together on this point. This does not involve increased pay for these officers; it is honorary only; it gives these officers the right to the title and rank of general and lieutenant general, as the case may be, on the retired list, if they have once attained the grade on active duty.

The Army's allowance of Medical Department generals was reduced from three-fourths of 1 percent of the strength of the Medical Department officer corps to one-half of 1 percent, to conform to the Navy percentage. This works out to give the Medical Department precisely the number of generals that was specified for the various corps of the Medical Department.

We required that Army branch chiefs be confirmed by the Senate and we required that only the President can effect their removal. The Army had proposed that these positions no longer require Senate confirmation, and branch chiefs could be removed at the pleasure of the Secretary of War. To provide reasonable security for these positions, and at the same time not so protect them as to make branch chiefs completely independent, we intruded the Senate and President into the process. It was unanimously agreed by the subcommittee that this will provide adequate protection for such branches as the Corps of Army Engineers—which was foremost in our minds at the time—and for the Judge Advocate General's Department.

Next, we amended the Navy bill to withdraw from the Navy its authority to retire officers in the next higher grade when they have received a commendation from the head of an executive department. We felt justified in this, for two reasons: First, the Navy Department itself opposed this provision when it first became law in 1925; and second, its extension to the Army would involve entirely too many officers. The Navy Department is reasonably content with our action on this point. Of course, this will not be retroactive. Officers already so retired will retain the status they now have under this provision of law.

Another amendment was to limit to the Army's World War I hump of lieutenant colonels the Army authority to retire lieutenant colonels as colonels after 28 years of service, when no vacancies are available for their promotion to the grade of colonel. The Army does not object to this very strongly; and we felt that this problem could best be handled in this way rather than extend the authority to the Navy.

Another change of some consequence was an amendment providing that, excepting disability retirements, the retirement pay of colonels, captains in the Navy, admirals and generals will not be a flat 75 percent of active-duty pay. The exact amount will be computed on the officer's length of service, up to 75 percent, as is done in lower grades. This has some collateral results. Other legislation is pending which would give 75 percent retirement to Army generals, and a law passed by the last Congress gave the same to admirals. Also, in the original Army promotion bill age retirements were a flat 75 percent of active-duty pay. Our position is that there is no logical basis for computing retirement pay of high ranking officers on a basis different from that of officers in lower grades. Normally, this amendment will not affect many officers, since most generals and admirals will receive the maximum 75 percent in any event; but those whose length of service would not entitle them to the 75 percent should not, in our opinion, be given it.

There were some thirty-odd amendments, Mr. Chairman, but I do not want to go into them unless it is necessary since they are comparatively minor in scope.

This completes my general statement on this important legislation, which will have far-reaching effects on the more than 175,000 officers in the services. The legislation is urgent. The Regular officers of the Army and Navy must have some assurance as to what the future holds for them or the services will lose a high proportion of their most capable men, and the morale of those who remain will be impaired. Also, do not forget what I mentioned before—that all the services are still on a war footing in many respects insofar as personnel needs are concerned. As a result, in the absence of this or other legislation, when the war is officially ended, the services would have to release the thousands of temporary officers who must be retained for some years to come. Our national defense would be dangerously weakened and our armed services demoralized. Quick passage of this bill is essential to our national security.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish first to congratulate the gentleman on the comprehensive, intelligent, and clear statement he has made. I think I understood the gentleman to say that promotions up to the grade of captain and even higher could be made without regard to vacancies.

Mr. SHORT. In the Army, up to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

Mr. EBERHARTER. What becomes of the tables of organization if promotions can be made when there are no vacancies? I wish the gentleman would explain that to me.

Mr. SHORT. The Army anticipates finding no difficulty in having vacancies for many years to come. I may say that under the Navy proposals there is a greater forced attrition than there is under the Army title, and we could not make the Army bill identical with the Navy bill because it is the first time the Army has ever had selection. It will require a number of years; they realize it and they are going to have many headaches in working this plan out successfully.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman indicates that there are many vacancies in different grades, and promotions can be made to them.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; because the Army anticipates having not more than 37,500 regular commissions although their authorized strength is 50,000; and the Navy has only 27,000. I may say to the gentleman that the Regular commissions in the Navy are 40,000, based on authorized strength.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Army has a great many extracurricular activities, such as the National Guard and the Reserve Corps which produce these vacancies.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman stated, I believe, that a change was made affecting those who had received certain medals or commendations who under the present law can retire at 75 percent; that the change did not affect those who had already retired, that it affected those who are qualified for retirement but have not retired; their authorization would be reduced. Is that right?

Mr. SHORT. No; under the present law men who had received commendations by an executive department could be retired at one grade higher than that which they held but at no increase in pay. Our committee eliminated that provision because the Navy itself had opposed it when it was originally adopted in 1925. They offered a bill as late as 1943 wanting to get rid of it. The Army never had it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not mean to differ with the gentleman, but I wonder if those people who are already qualified under that provision of the present law should not be protected under the new law.

Mr. SHORT. They are protected. I tried to make it clear that the law is not retroactive. The officers already so retired will retain the status they are entitled to under the provisions of the law.

Mr. WHITTEN. But those who could retire under that provision would be affected adversely.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; they would be. We are going to stop it because we think

it should never have been instituted in the beginning.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the very excellent statement he has made and to ask him what the ultimate cost will be to the taxpayers?

Mr. SHORT. Very little, if any. In fact, there will be no increase in cost until we reach stabilized conditions after the transition period 10 years hence. There may be some slight increase then to the Navy, but thereafter it will rapidly decrease until there will actually be a saving; and, as far as the Army is concerned, the increase, if any, will be about thirty-three one-hundredths of 1 percent; and we feel that the advantages greatly outweigh that.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I also would like to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his wonderful statement here today and the work of his committee in trying to iron out this situation. I speak in behalf of some of the GI's in the last war. We feel like seniority and all that should be taken care of and we appreciate what you have done here. Is it not a fact that under the old system it would be absolutely impossible to utilize the services of a young man similar to Napoleon Bonaparte who reached the height of his efficiency as lieutenant colonel at 27 years? It would be impossible to utilize a man that young?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is eminently correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman tell me whether this is correct: Under the new promotion plan for those in the grades below general officer, does the seniority system maintain except that those officers who are not qualified are eliminated? Is that what it amounts to?

Mr. SHORT. No. Officers in both the Army and Navy will be elevated or chosen by a selection board set up by each department. If they fail twice of selection by the board, and a different board in each instance, then they go out. They either go up or out.

Mr. ALBERT. Is any provision made to guarantee that officers other than those who are graduates of service schools will be on the selection board?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad the gentleman asks that question because I consider one of the best features of the bill the assurance to our people in the future that a vast majority of the officers in both the Army and Navy will not be graduates of either West Point or Annapolis.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. It is a fact that at the present time, out of 137,000 officers on duty in the Army, only 8,000 are graduates of West Point?

Mr. SHORT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that on this occasion I find myself in the same boat with the genial gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. We are traveling in the same direction and trying to reach the same objective. I have traveled with him on former occasions and can report that it is always a pleasure to be in his company. Necessarily my approach to the discussion of this bill will be similar to his. I will try however to give a brief but comprehensive analysis of the main features of the bill. I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for the hard-working energy and close application he gave to the study of this complicated subject. His report to the full committee is a model of correct analytical statement, concise, clear, and well-expressed. I, personally, am much indebted to him for his fair and impartial guidance in the work of the subcommittee.

In my opinion it is impossible to pass a perfect general promotion bill. It is practically impossible to get a bill which will meet with the approval of every officer in the armed services, yet the Armed Services Committee has tried to do that very thing in this bill, providing for the promotion and elimination of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. It contains 303 pages. It has taken several months for the committee, working rather steadily and continuously, to draft the bill. It was not drafted until it had been studied by the officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, as well as by the enlisted men of said services and the National Guard, and then further opportunity was given to everybody who wished to be heard. It has the approval of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It is, of course, physically impossible, in the time given over to the discussion of this bill, to go into every phase of it, and I do not know that a discussion of any phase of it would do more than be an expression of opinion. Due to the many changes that arose out of the war, it was very important, in fact, essential, that some kind of legislation should be passed that would relieve the minds of the men in the services and definitely fix their permanent status. This bill is the answer of the committee to the request for permanent legislation. If there should be any injustices in the bill or any changes become necessary, such changes can very readily be adjusted by amendment of this basic law.

At the present time the promotion of officers is controlled by temporary appointments under wartime regulations as the provisions of the permanent law were

suspended in 1942 in order to meet the changing conditions due to the war. This bill stabilizes such temporary promotions and gives permanent status. It is not entirely rigid in its application for it was recognized that there should be some flexibility to prevent unfairness to some officers who served brilliantly during the war in their temporary assignments, and in addition there must be some flexibility to meet conditions that may arise in the future. The committee believes that it is a fair, orderly, and economical system creating a promotional flow in the service that will hold qualified officers in the service and attract many young men who wish to make their service in the Army or Navy their life work.

The bill applies equally to the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps. Hearings were had separately with reference to the Army and the Navy, and then the final conclusion to draft it into one bill with an attempt, as far as was possible, to have a similarity in the procurement, distribution, and promotion of men of both services. This is, of course, not the first promotion bill to come before Congress, but it is the most comprehensive bill that has been proposed. So far as the Navy is concerned, acts were passed in 1916, 1917, 1926, 1934, 1935, 1938, and 1940 on the various divisions of the Navy, and in the approach to the drafting of this over-all act a careful examination was made of all existing law, and there was a historical study of previous laws in order to determine which principles of those laws were sound and would fit the Navy as of today. As said by Commander Martineau in the hearings on the bill:

Actually this bill does not by any means represent any revolutionary step. It is merely a part of the evolutionary process whereby we have built up through the years what we consider to be an effective Navy promotion system. This is simply another step along the way, a refinement of the principles that have developed really since 1916.

I quote this to show the very serious and comprehensive investigation that was made by the Navy authorities in the drafting of this bill; and it being the idea of the committee as well as of the services not to have anything that would be radical. I think the same approach was made by the Army and a special War Department Board was created for the purpose.

This Board found a similar condition as to former promotion laws. The present promotion law was enacted in 1920. It was amended in 1935 and in 1940. This proposed legislation was the result of many months of intensive research and study, with attention to former laws and a redrafting to meet conditions which existed during the war and still exist. The legislation for the Army promotional system contained in this bill has the approval of the General Staff and all the ranking officers of the various arms of the service. It was fully studied and discussed.

The principle of selection governs the promotion of all officers in the Army and Navy. However, the application of the principle necessarily varies in certain particulars. The Navy has followed the principle of selection for more

than 30 years. So this bill returns the Navy to that system of permanent promotion by selection but makes some provision for temporary ranks required by the transition from wartime conditions. Certain other changes in the selection system are believed to be improvements based upon the experience acquired during the years of war.

The Army will also have promotion by selection, but the application of the principle is not the same as in the Navy. Instead of following the Navy system of selecting only the best-qualified officers up, the Army system will select up all qualified officers and eliminate the unqualified. The result in the end will be the same.

The Army Regular officer strength will be about 37,500 officers this year but the active-duty officer strength will be over 100,000. This is due to the necessity for continuing temporary promotions as long as the said officers are necessary in the service. A similar condition exists in the Navy but not to as great an extent, as 27,000 Regulars are represented in its more than 40,000 officers. This bill, therefore, provides a permanent career plan for those in the Regular Army and Navy, and also provides for carrying along the temporary officers.

There are some changes in both Army and Navy in the existing promotion law. For instance admiral rank could be reached as old as 60. Now a naval officer may reach admiral rank at 53. This step will give younger men an opportunity for service in high rank. Also the principle of selection is applied to the admiral grade instead of being retained until he reaches retirement age, or resigns, or dies in office. Again provision is made for increasing the number of officers in the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain, while the number in the grades of ensign and lieutenant were decreased. It was found that additional numbers were needed in the higher grades to fill positions requiring more highly technical duties. These are some of the changes that improve the existing system in the Navy.

The greatest change in the Army system was promotion by selection in the lower grades beginning in the grade of lieutenant. Promotions on a basis of seniority alone are discarded. Again, the Army plan has various promotion lists, so that officers have their promotion opportunity without reference to the branch in which they are serving. Army officers will be appointed in the Regular Army rather than in a certain arm of the service. This will permit the Secretary of War to transfer officers as military needs require. Also, only the best-qualified officers, after the grade of lieutenant colonel will be promoted to fill vacancies.

Before leaving the subject, it should be noted that the subcommittee thought that there should be no five-star rank in peacetime, and that it should be considered a wartime rank.

The committee at the same time reduced the number of officers of star rank below the proposals contained in the bills as introduced. The number of said grades was reached after a detailed study

of the billets the services planned for general and admiral grades.

The above, I believe, is a fairly full exposition of the purposes and details of the proposed legislation. It has been most carefully and studiously studied and planned. As far as I know it meets with the approval of all the services of our Military Establishment. After all, they are the persons more directly concerned. The plan is equitable and it is economical. After the plan is put into operation, if it be found that changes are desirable they can easily be made by the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3830, is a tremendous piece of work. I compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], chairman of the subcommittee, upon the production of this bill.

I have spent three evenings trying to read this, and I am free to say that even at the end of three evenings, and with some previous experience, I have relatively little knowledge of what the bill contains. I understand that the subcommittee took some 10 weeks in its preparation. It is a bill of tremendous importance to the people of this Nation, for not only does it affect the future of their armed services, but it affects, as the gentleman from Missouri has said, some 175,000 or 180,000 commissioned officers of those services.

An immense amount of experience has gone into this bill. The Navy has had some 30 years of experience with selection and it has tried to embody that in the bill. The Navy has had various schemes during all of that time. When I first started in the service, the only way promotion was achieved was by death, old age, retirement, or by the selection out of a very few people. That proved to be very poor practice, and shortly thereafter the system was changed so that in 1916 we brought in this selection system for officers of the Navy, applying it at that time only from the grade of lieutenant commander up.

The scheme as used at that time was kept for a few years, then gradually we modified it so as to extend it down to and including officers of the grade of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy.

Accompanying any system of promotion you will find a system of retirement, and that, Mr. Chairman, is one of the most important things which can affect any service; how to get the boys out so as to make room for others then down at the bottom. If you do not do that, in a short time your service becomes top-heavy with old men, and believe me, they do get old, because they will not move until they are put out.

There was a time some years ago when an officer when he became a rear admiral was from 62 to 63½ years old, and a captain got into his grade usually around 60 or a little above. That was in effect even at the time of what we called a "plucking board," then modifications came along and they began to retire people in connection with a selection

system for age in grade. That seemed to be a very desirable thing for a while. If a captain became 56 years of age he was retired, and so on down the line. But it was not adaptable to our system because the boys have a latitude of 4 years in entering the Naval Academy, so you soon came to the point where officers in the service were being retired for age without ever having had a chance of promotion.

The American people do not like that sort of thing and so they gradually changed the law until it was required that an officer should be passed over twice in his grade and should have attained a certain amount of commissioned service.

Under this new proposal, it will be amplified again so that you will have service-in-grade in combination with total commissioned service and also that of being passed over.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy schemes have been well tried out. There is no perfect bill for promotion or retirement. It steps on too many people's toes. You cannot possibly make everybody an admiral or everybody a general and so we cannot get a perfect scheme, but it looks to me as if this one is about as fair as anything we can develop at the present time.

The proposed bill does several things. First, it provides for forced retirement in the flag grades, which is a very necessary feature. The gentleman from Missouri mentioned in that connection that we were getting rid of the deadwood. I do not agree with the gentleman from Missouri in that respect. We have very little deadwood in the flag grades at the present time. We are getting rid of a number of officers in the flag grades so as to make it possible for the younger men to come up to be promoted without having to wait all their lives for such an occasion to take place. It is a most desirable provision, and I certainly hope it will be retained.

Second, this bill contains a provision for selection down to the grade of junior lieutenant, which is in accordance with the present system.

Third, it provides for the discharge of lieutenants and lieutenants, junior grade, if they fail to live up to the needs of the service or prove themselves unsuitable for the naval service.

I have had many complaints about the idea of taking a lieutenant or a junior lieutenant and putting him out on the cold, cold world with only up to 2 years' pay. I cannot see any reason why the Government should feel it is necessary to support a reasonably young man all of his life just because he had a commission in the Navy and was unable to make good insofar as the naval service is concerned. I think that is an excellent provision.

Fourth, this bill continues the temporary officer set-up, as I understand it, until the line has reached 95 percent of its permanent strength or until January 1, 1957, whichever is the first. I believe that is correct, is it not, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri, that the bill continues the temporary set-up until January 1, 1957?

Mr. SHORT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it also applies selection to the Army. Naturally, I cannot speak very much for the Army, but I do know that no system which provides for promotion just because you live long enough, and because you wear shoes, is of any value to the military service.

I appreciate that the whole arrangement will be far from perfect for the Army at the present time. The Army has not had the experience, but I feel confident that the Army will work out a good system after a little experience.

There are some details about this proposed law which I do not believe are advisable. I realize that we cannot all think the same way, and I have no intention of trying to write legislation of this complexity on the floor of the House.

However, I hope to comment on a few sections as they are brought up in the belief that such comment should be made a part of the record so that they may be available for the use of hearings which may be held in another legislative body on this set-up.

I assume the gentleman from Missouri will soon be asking unanimous consent to consider large portions of the bill as read for the purpose of amendment, and to that I shall not object, but I hope the gentleman from Missouri will go along with me if I find it necessary to ask for a little more time at some particular points due to the committee considering such large sections of the bill at one time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this has been a most difficult bill to prepare. It happens not to be my first experience with personnel legislation for the armed services, for during the 8 years of my service as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I had to do with personnel problems. In all personnel matters the issues are very complex.

This bill has been very carefully balanced. Should it be upset in any one of its portions it would throw the other portions of the bill out of balance. I want to call attention particularly to the fact that it covers the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. This is the first time we have ever been able to consider a promotion bill for the three services together. In the past a Navy promotion bill would go to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and an Army bill to the Committee on Military Affairs. There would be different features in each bill and there would be a constant attempt on the part of one to catch up with the other. In this instance we have attempted to take all of the services and fix comparable ranks on comparable bases just as much as it was possible to do so. In other words, a man holding the rank of lieutenant—senior grade—in the Navy would to all intents and purposes be on a footing with a captain in the Army, and so on through the comparable grades.

I want to emphasize the fact that we have had to approach the two services from a different viewpoint. At the pres-

ent time nobody knows what the strength of the Army is to be. Until a few days ago we still had permanent law fixing the strength of the Army at 286,000. That ceiling was suspended only during the war, and again suspended during the recruitment period. The other day we completed work on a conference report which repeals that ceiling, but what the ceiling will be no one knows, because we have never reached that point. So the only permanent figure that we have for the Army is the authorized commissioned strength.

Permanent legislation now fixes the regular Army officer strength at 50,000. That is an increase over the 16,000 in the Regular Army at the time the expansion of the Army began immediately prior to the war. On the other hand, in the Navy we have permanent legislation enacted in the last Congress which fixes the permanent peacetime strength of the Navy at 500,000 and provides the percentage basis on which officers shall be assigned. It is 7 percent for the line of the Navy. Therefore, there is an authorized strength of 35,000 Regular Navy officers. So in approaching this bill we could approach it as it affected the Navy from the standpoint of its over-all strength and the percentage of the officers in the various grades as compared to enlisted men. But when it came to the Army, not knowing what their permanent enlisted strength is going to be, we had to approach it on a percentage distribution of the officer strength.

Comment was made with reference to starting for the first time in the Army the selective promotion system. This is true. Beginning with the promotion to captain hereafter selections boards will be used by the Army in promotions. There is a distinction. It is a modified Navy plan, and it is designed to give the Army some experience with selection before it can hope to equal what the Navy after more than 30 years of experience has accomplished. The Navy started the selection system in 1916.

Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of War has two alternatives: He can either have selection up or out, or he can have selection of the best fitted, such as the Navy now has, and in that manner there would be forced attrition.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, or some other Member, asked with reference to promoting men to grades regardless of vacancies. The Army is not on the same basis as the Navy on billets so-called in the various ranks. The Navy is an operational force, whereas the Army serves as a cadre to be expanded rapidly in time of war in order to provide an adequate Army. So this bill provides for overflowing the grades of the officers in the Army. There is plenty of work for them to do. They will serve in the high schools and colleges of the country as instructors to ROTC units; they will serve with the National Guard and Organized Reserve organizations and things of that kind. In addition, modern warfare experimentation and development will require a great many officers.

It should be stressed also that nobody got all he wanted in this bill. The Army and the Navy definitely did not get all

they asked for. As a matter of fact, they got a rather small portion of what they asked for in the higher grades of generals.

The committee took the position that the highest grades authorized in time of war were probably not necessary in time of peace. The five-star admiral rank and five-star general rank, which now adheres to the persons of those holding them, will expire with their person. They will hold that rank when they go off active duty into retirement. Thereafter there will be but four 4-star generals in the Army; there will be three 4-star admirals in the Navy, with one 4-star general as Commandant of the Marine Corps; there will be three 4-star generals for the Army Air Forces. In the other ranks below there has been a comparable reduction in those ranks.

The bill provides for a percentage distribution of officers. I know there has been some talk on the floor and some mail received and some ill-considered editorials in the papers with reference to promotion in the various ranks. The information is available here with reference to those matters, and members of the committee are in a position, I think, to satisfy you on them.

As time has gone on during the weeks we have been considering this bill, and we have been in session practically daily, many different groups have come forward asking special consideration for their group. I doubt if there has been any single group in the Army, with one exception, that has not asked for some special consideration. The group that has not asked special consideration is the fighting man, the man who does the fighting, the fellow who carries the gun in the infantry into the front lines. There has not been any pressure for him. He is the only one who has not been represented before the committee. We have treated them all alike and have rejected many of the special considerations which they asked. That applies to the branches which have come in with requests for special promotion lists and things of that kind.

The bill provides that the chiefs of these services shall come from the general officers of the line. When it came to the committee that was the extent of the provision. In other words, they would be designated by the Secretary of War and would serve at his pleasure. The committee saw fit to provide that they be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term normally of 4 years while they served in the position of chief of a branch.

I know many of you have received letters about this situation as it existed in the original bill, but I believe that in the bill as we have reported it we have given adequate safeguards with reference to those chiefs of branches. I do not know whether there are those here who care to ask questions about that. The committee is prepared to answer them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment before I close on the necessity for prompt action on this legislation. We have, of course, about 137,000 officers in the Army, something less than that in the Navy. I do not have the figure at

the moment. But unless the Regular Army man knows where he stands, now that we have increased his strength, from 16,000 to 50,000, unless he knows what length of career he is going to have and what he may anticipate with reference to promotion, you are not going to keep your good men. You will keep the man who cannot do as well on the outside or the man who cannot get a job on the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the man who is desired by private industry, who is receiving attractive offers at all times from private industry, is not going to stay as a professional in your service unless he knows where he is. I therefore hope there will be prompt action both here and in the other body on this legislation.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement and we appreciate it. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the belief of the committee that the chief of a special service should be selected from the line of officers? Should the Judge Advocate General of the United States Army be selected from the infantry or should he be a specialist in the field of law?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that all of these chiefs shall be chosen from the generals of the line. There is an additional provision following that with reference to the appointment of chiefs of branches. There has never been a law requiring the Judge Advocate General to be a member of the Judge Advocate Corps, there has never been a law requiring the Chief of Engineers to be a member of the engineering corps, and so on. It has always been possible for the President to nominate any man he saw fit in the Army to head these branches. That power is continued here. Within the entire history of the permanent law as it now exists and as carried forward in this legislation, on four occasions the Army has failed to choose the branch chief from that branch. At the present time General Larkin is serving as quartermaster general of the Army. He is an engineering officer. But he came from the European Theater where his primary function was provision for the Army in the front lines, and he has had wide experience in that. General Lowry, recently retired as Chief of Army Finance, was a Coast Artillery officer who went to that position from the position of budget officer of the War Department. General DeWitt some years ago was appointed Quartermaster General, and General Baker, at one time was also appointed Quartermaster General. But the law is not changed in that respect. So, there is no greater danger, in my mind, of an engineer being appointed to head the law department of the Army, or a lawyer appointed to head the engineering department of the Army, than there has been in the past. Of

course, he must now come from generals of the line. Heretofore he has generally come from colonels or lieutenant colonels of the branch. That was necessarily true, because those branches could not have generals. When they became colonels their careers were finished, unless they were chosen by the President to serve as branch chiefs or assistant chiefs, when they would be nominated and confirmed for rank of major general or brigadier general, to hold the rank while occupying the position. So, while the branch chiefs will now come from generals of the line, members of the branches may now become generals of the line, something that they have not enjoyed in the past.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the rank given to the chiefs of the branches?

Mr. KILDAY. That is another instance in which we attempted to standardize the organization of the Army and the Navy. It is required by this bill that they be the equivalent of two-star officers; a major general in the Army or a rear admiral in the Navy, and that comparable positions shall hold comparable grades.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true that our committee strove hard through the hearings to equalize the burdens and the opportunities between the two services as much as was humanly possible?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, and I think we have done a good job in getting the Army and the Navy together. I know that the large groups of Army and Navy men that worked with us on this matter will always have kindly feelings toward each other and be able to approach each other more easily, because they worked together as a common team.

Mr. SHORT. Not only the Army and the Navy worked together, but the Marine Corps.

Mr. KILDAY. We had all of them with us, and I might say we had them for weeks on end, and at one time I thought we would never finish with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman I ask for these few minutes to bring out a point or two of my observations from the past in this type of legislation. At the outset I want to express my commendation of the Committee on Armed Services and especially the Subcommittee on Personnel for the progress that they have made in the matter of promotion legislation. I speak with some experience in that field, because I served on this subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs for 8 years. I had my first baptism of fire in 1939 in opposing the Woodring bill and writing the dissenting opinion, or helping to write that opinion with now Senator SPARKMAN to kill off the Woodring bill and

bring in the promotion bill of 1939. That bill which developed in 1939 in place of the Woodring bill was not a perfect bill by any means. It was only calculated to correct as many inequities as possible in the World War hump without doing injustice to the individual officers who had struggled under that hump from the time of World War I.

The bill now before the House is a long step forward in looking to a fair and equitable solution of the promotion problem. In the 1939 consideration of the promotion bill I had a long discussion with the Chief of Staff and his Assistant Chief of Staff G-1 (personnel) regarding a promotion-by-selection provision in the law. At that time it was explained to me that the paper records of the Army were not adequate to maintain a promotion-by-selection system; in other words, the ratings were too irregular and not uniform and complete enough to allow them to go to a promotion-by-selection plan at that time. With that background you can understand why I have taken particular interest in studying the new personnel reports and cards that they have devised for making a promotion-by-selection law workable. The rating given to the individual officer by the various senior officers must be carefully done and rather uniformly done in order to carry out a promotion-by-selection system adequately and fairly. I have studied the new personnel report forms in the Army papers within recent weeks and I am very pleased with the work done by the War Department, of which I am speaking particularly, in building up a better and more workable personnel rating. Through the years ahead I believe it will be possible for the War Department to administer this bill much more fairly than we could under the old rating plan.

There is one subject we tried to cover in our committee report in 1939 a little more fully than you have here, perhaps, in some respects, and that is the matter of elimination of officers. This matter may come up for further consideration in other legislation but that part of the system provided in this bill for the elimination of the unfit is a good start. The success of this bill you are now considering in achieving the elimination of the unfit or unqualified officer personnel will be dependent upon the will or the desire of the War Department officials to eliminate the unfit or the unqualified. I only wish it were possible to include in this legislation some provision requiring them to eliminate a small percentage. My observations between World War I and World War II were that the War Department and the high Army officers did not proceed to eliminate a lot of deadwood that might have been eliminated to the betterment of the service. I will watch their administration of this law with great interest to see whether or not they have improved in that direction.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Was not that failure, a failure which I witnessed myself down through the years, due in

large part to the legislation we passed in 1920, which created what was known as the class B Board in the Army? That board would slate a certain number of unqualified officers for retirement on a percentage basis with respect to their salaries. Then we also put in that law a provision to the effect that the officer who had been class B'd could appeal to a board of inquiry, and it was up there that he was sustained.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman. I know the gentleman from New York knows what he is talking about, because while I was a lieutenant in the Army the gentleman from New York was chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and had a very real part in drafting the reorganization legislation following World War I. He rendered outstanding and distinguished service to our Nation. I saw the laws we are here talking about in actual operation, and I know that that appeal provision placing too much emphasis on the individual, forgetting and taking the emphasis completely off the good of the Nation and the adequacy of our national defense, and very nearly disrupted the whole system. The Army and War Department officials worked under a great handicap.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under that law, the final order which would place an unfit man on the retired list was made by the President of the United States. If the man was turned down by the B Board, and even the court of inquiry, well, a grave and reverend Senator would reach the President of the United States and ask him not to issue the order, and he often succeeded in persuading him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and the number eliminated through the machinery set up by law was so tiny that it left the matter of housecleaning the deadwood out of the Army a standing joke for the world to behold. That was the weakest single point in our entire national defense structure between World War I and World War II. I am speaking now about the Army part of it; not the Navy.

I wish it were possible for us to consider requiring the elimination of a percentage of deadwood as a minimum, but I shall not offer it in connection with this bill. I will withhold any such amendment to this bill and observe developments. I know from talks I have had with the General Staff and the War Department that they are very anxious to remedy that defect now. I sincerely hope the Army and War Department leaders will find it possible to kick out the drones and the deadwood in the years to come. This is the weakest point in Army personnel legislation. The one charged with inefficiency and incompetency has had the upper hand. The result has been that all too few of them have been eliminated and we have carried a sizeable load of deadwood. Not a large percentage of officers are drones, but even a relatively small number of them make up a very great burden on our national defense. It is imperative that the drones be eliminated if our Nation is to be adequately protected in this war-torn world.

Referring to another point about this bill, I am glad that you have limited to the World War I hump the automatic promotion on retirement, from lieutenant colonel to colonel, for those who have served more than 28 years. That is a wise provision. That was put in the promotion law of 1939 only to take care of the hump and was not intended as permanent legislation.

We were faced with a terrific problem between World War I and World War II because the officer personnel was so nearly of the same age and so nearly of the same length of military experience. They were all right as lieutenants. I was one of them, and I know. It is fine to have a lot of lieutenants, but 20 years later when I became a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I woke up to the fact that the same young lieutenants of 1917-20 were then of an age when they should have been made majors and lieutenant colonels; and although we did not have enough places to use that many majors and lieutenant colonels, in fairness to the individual officers, they should have been given promotion to those ranks by that time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman recognizes, however, that under the pending bill we do accelerate promotion.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SHORT. It has been too slow in the past, but now we make it possible for men of the younger age to reach the rank of admiral and flag grade or general rank.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. In fact, you have done such a good job on that that it is hard for me to adequately express my approval and admiration for the work that you have done.

The promotion provisions that you are now outlining in this bill should be very successful in keeping the Army young, alert, efficient, and effective, and, believe me, we are going into an era now when they must be kept young, alert, efficient, and effective.

Mr. SHORT. It should not be forgotten that we are going to have competition hereafter even between the admirals, and they are going to work to keep their rank.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, indeed. I want to commend you especially for the limitations that you have placed on the grades of general and admiral rank, placing them in real competition to hold their own. That competition is not going to hurt the armed services a bit. It will be a wholesome thing, and it will keep our national defense much more alert.

Mr. SHORT. May I ask the gentleman just one other question. I do so because he has served many years not only in the Army, but in our Committee on Military Affairs. I think he is competent to speak on it. The gentleman realizes that having dealt so long and so hard with the problem of promotion it is exceedingly difficult, if not well nigh impossible, to write any formula that will do exact justice to everybody. When you help Joe, you are likely to hurt John.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree very strongly with the gentleman on that.

Mr. SHORT. There are some inescapable inequities in any general formula, and no general formula can possibly take care of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman very strongly. Again I commend the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Personnel especially, for the outstanding work you have done on the proposed legislation now under consideration.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the committee has brought forth a bill which represents a tremendous amount of study and undoubtedly it is an improvement over existing law in many respects. However, I wish to call attention to a particular part of the bill which I believe may lead to trouble in the future. I hope it will not. It has been brought out by questions which have been asked of speakers on the floor in debate already.

I refer to the question of appointments of the chiefs of branches from the general officers holding office in the grade prescribed by law for such officers and which is set forth in section 513 of this bill. In the past, these chiefs of branches, 13 in number, have been appointed more or less rigorously from the particular branches which they were to head. In my home district, we have two particular branches which are peculiarly indigenous to my district in peacetime. That is the branch which has to do with ordnance and the branch which has to do with the Army engineers.

I believe that the records that have been made by these two branches in the past have indicated the success with which the appointments of Chiefs of Branches for Ordnance and for Engineers have been made. I am sorry to see any change made which would permit a major general of the line to go in as either Chief of Engineers or Chief of Ordnance on the basis that he has had duty similar to that required by the assignment he may fill. I think it should be left as it is today, that the Chief of Engineers should, insofar as possible, be selected from the Corps of Engineers and that the Chief of Ordnance should be selected from the Ordnance Department. The requirement that the person appointed must be a major general would open up selection from the entire Army other than the special branches which are excluded, such as the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, and Chaplains. It seems to me it is quite possible that some major general with a distinguished career in other departments, who is on active duty but for whom there is no particular berth, may desire to become the chief of a branch and he can by showing that he has been in a duty similar to either the Engineers or Ordnance, be in position almost to demand appointment to the position of chief of the branch which may be vacant. I would prefer to follow the present system under which the President is entitled to nominate from officers down to the rank of colonel of engineers the Chief of Engineers, and the Chief of

Ordnance likewise. Hereafter, if this bill becomes law, he will have to appoint a major general unless he is going to say there is no major general in the Army capable of holding the job. The result will be in normal peacetime operations rather serious, I believe, in some situations involving the engineers, which have largely to do with rivers and harbors and flood-control work on which hundreds of millions of dollars will be expended each year. One would expect in peacetime that the Chief of Engineers would be very familiar with one of those two types of service. He might come from having served as division engineer at the city of New York, the city of Chicago, or New Orleans, or Boston. Under the system followed in the past, such an officer is likely to be a colonel, and even though he may have had the 28 years' experience now required to become Chief of Ordnance, nevertheless he will be barred because he does not hold the rank of major general and cannot therefore be considered for the position. For that reason, therefore, I feel, and so expressed myself in the committee, as being in favor of permitting these two branches at least to be considered separately like the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, and the Chaplains Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to point out and call the gentleman's attention to paragraph (e) on page 27 beginning in line 8, requiring that chiefs of branches and assistants shall be officers who have demonstrated by actual and extended duty in such Army branch or service or in similar duty that he is qualified for such assignment; and, further, whereas the original Army bill contained a provision that these chiefs should be appointed by the Secretary of War and removed by the Secretary of War, our subcommittee reinstated appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate and that they could be removed only by the President. So we did safeguard it.

Mr. CLASON. I think the subcommittee strengthened the bill greatly by that change. Until that change was made the President and the Senate apparently had no control over such appointments.

There is another department or branch which I feel is very much composed of specialists, and that is the Judge Advocate General's department to which reference has been made. While I have not had the close contact with officers of the Judge Advocate General's department that I have had with Ordnance and Engineers, nevertheless, it is hard for me to believe that it is possible to consider that service as other than a specialized service. Generals in the Army testified that in war time more than 90 percent of the work done by the Judge Advocate General's department has to do with

legal questions and that in peace time more than two thirds of the work has to do with legal questions. It seems to me therefore that when you have a service or a branch which is as specialized as the Judge Advocate General's department, and so testified by high ranking officers in the department, that the only fair thing is to set that apart like the Medical Corps as a separate branch.

Certainly if we had relatives in the Army and they were subject to criminal process or court martial, we would feel we would want them to be treated with the highest regard. The only way we can safeguard them is by making the Judge Advocate General's department a department where lawyers shall be appointed who are capable of handling the work, and not unqualified, as has happened during the war, due to the scarcity of lawyers with commissions, where the defense had to be oftentimes conducted by an officer, willing and able undoubtedly but not qualified to conduct a criminal case.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the hearings on the Judge Advocate's bill, every single witness suggested a change in the setup and the particular thing they stressed was to have independent officers free from the line command. Is that not so?

Mr. CLASON. That is true as to every witness other than witnesses from the War Department. In other words, the American Bar Association, every one of the various other bar associations, all of the veterans organizations, and every witness who appeared independently of the War Department insisted that the Judge Advocate General's department should be a separate service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, it hardly seems necessary for me to discuss the details of this bill, which have been so fully outlined by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]; the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY]; and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. It may not be out of the way for me, however, to make some observations, first, in a general way, then, specifically, having to do with certain provisions of this bill as they were brought about through cooperation between the membership of the Subcommittee on Personnel.

I call attention of the committee and the House to the fact that about 6 months ago, when the reorganization bill became effective, the so-called Armed Services Committee was formed. It consisted of approximately one-half former members of the Naval Affairs Committee and the other half former members of the Military Affairs Committee. The process of integration was not an easy one. But the

committee set about its business. It was as a result of unanimous action of the full Committee on Armed Services that the committee was set up into functional subcommittees, and, as a matter of record, the membership of each subcommittee represented one-half of those from the former Naval Affairs Committee and one-half from the former Military Affairs Committee. At the same time the chairmanships on the majority side of these subcommittees were awarded on the basis of one-half from each of the former service committees, and, similarly speaking, insofar as we were able to accomplish it, the ranking minority members of each subcommittee were chosen in the same way.

Subcommittee No. 1 on Personnel, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is chairman, represents a membership, and obviously for good reason, of the more mature, older members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. In dealing with the important questions of personnel that, of course, is most important.

I would like to say something about the deliberations that went on in arriving at the unanimous opinion of 12 members of this subcommittee—10 members under the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY]—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and myself acting ex officio. The deliberations went on for approximately 3 months. There were some considerations resolved and reconciliations made that had to do most importantly with the high command of the Army, on the ground and in the air; the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something about a gentleman who is not here today.

I speak of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, former chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, during the war and for many years before, an outstanding legislator, naval-wise and otherwise who, as ranking minority member on this committee, from my viewpoint, has probably contributed more than any other single member of the committee or of the House to the successful consolidation of the Armed Services Committee. In particular, referring to the divisions in this bill involving high rank and the decrease in high rank and the unilateral treatment given to branches of the services across the board, he has revealed one of the finest spirits of cooperation legislatively of any Representative with whom I have ever had knowledge. There is a reduction in high rank. The five-star rank goes out. There is a reduction of four stars, and there is equalized treatment for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

So, at this point I wish to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is unavoidably absent because of illness in his family, and to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that in my entire legislative experience I have never seen more consistent consideration, investigation, and successful effort culminate in the unanimous opinion of 12 men,

and thereafter report of 33 members of the Armed Services Committee, in an important bill such as this.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as having been read, and that amendments may be in order to each title and section in chronological order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is long and quite technical and involved, and I do not intend to discuss it, because I have not the familiarity that I should have to discuss it properly. However, I want to discuss a problem which I think besets the military forces from stem to stern, and that is adequate consideration for those in the service who are willing and able to become technically proficient in any specialized line of the service.

I might speak, for example, of those who are engaged in the study and advancement of the art of electronics either in the Navy or the Army, the Air Corps or the Marine Corps. That is a study which cannot be made and completed and fully utilized in a 4-year tour of duty. It is almost a life study. If the Navy and the Army and the Marine Corps are to have within the service the benefit of the best training and the best type of experience to solve these technical problems in the modern art of warfare, they must not only permit these men to continue in their chosen lines of work over a period of years, but they must likewise give them the opportunity for promotion that they do not now share with those who are so-called line officers. Apparently the Army and the Navy and also the Marine Corps believe that unless a man is qualified to lead troops or ships in battle that he is not qualified for high rank. That, of course, is a mistake. It is important that we have a sufficient number of generals qualified to lead troops in battle, but we have got to have men who are qualified to consider the technical problems of the services and to advance the art of the services to the point where the field forces can be technically proficient.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from California knows that we have made a provision in the pending bill whereby enlisted men in the Navy can rise to the rank of commander as well as warrant officer; perhaps a better opportunity than they ever had before, with some guaranty of security to protect them. We have also provided that highly technically trained men doing scientific work in certain fields are given a chance to become officers.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me just tell you something. These highly technically proficient gentlemen not only should be

given a chance to become officers, they would not even work for your Navy or your Army if they were not officers to start with. They have had better educations and better experience for the most part than anybody who ever graduated from the Naval or Military Academies.

Mr. SHORT. They are officers under the provisions of this bill, and they are given greater protection than officers in the line.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope they are given ample opportunity to practice their professions, but do not think you can class them as worthy enlisted or warrant personnel.

On yesterday I had occasion to address the Institute of Navigation at its third annual meeting here in Washington, and I discovered, among other things, that the Navy Department, for example, is abandoning its efforts to provide for qualified aerial navigators in the Navy. That is a ridiculous situation, because if any group in the Navy—and it applies to the Army also—should become highly proficient in aerial navigation it should be in those services. They went out and gathered in a lot of young men during this war and trained them to be navigators. Today there is not an aerial navigator left in the naval air service. Just why that should be I do not know, except that the brass hats at the top have decreed that these men should become grounded in all aspects of the naval profession. Hence they are being assigned to sea duty now to work on cruisers, battleships, and so forth, instead of being permitted to continue their work as aerial navigators.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman think an officer of the Navy who is to navigate a ship or an airplane should not be qualified to navigate both?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, I do; but I do not think the navigation of an airplane has a great deal to do with the navigation of a ship. The navigator of an airplane does what is known as pressure pattern flying. It has nothing to do with sailing a ship, it has nothing to do with a submarine, it has nothing to do with anything on the surface at all. Yet the business of pressure pattern flying and the meteorology that is required for it, the technical knowledge of the electronics that are concerned in it, and a great many other factors, should be preserved in qualified personnel in the Naval Air Forces. For the Navy Department or any department of the Government to say that a man trained in aviation and who becomes proficient in the arts and sciences related to aviation should have to serve on a battleship or submarine in order to obtain experience

to qualify him for rank is the most cockeyed, asinine thing I have ever heard of. Specialists must be encouraged or good men will refuse to specialize. I should like to leave that with the Committee. I hope the brass hats in both services will read my remarks.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this case I address myself particularly to that part of the bill on page 47 covered by lines 9 to 14, which is the part referred to by the gentleman from Missouri in regard to the relative ranks of brigadier general and rear admiral.

This provision is included in several sections of the act and it is a most remarkable one. The condition which it purports to correct has a long history running back at least to 1917 and probably further.

I have no argument with the desirability of the purposes of the provision. My argument is with the method set forth, in which we are setting out by legislative process to demonstrate that one of the most fundamental algebraic axioms is in error, in which we are trying to out-Einstein Dr. Einstein himself, for in his most exuberant moments he merely sought to prove that something unknown and unbelievable to us could be brought within the comprehension of the human mind, whereas we are endeavoring to demonstrate that things equal to the same thing are not equal to each other, for specifically we are saying, in effect, that the grades of brigadier general and major general are both equal to rear admiral, yet are not the same thing insofar as rank is concerned.

Let us look at this picture in a simple way. There is only one grade of rear admiral recognized by our laws. There are two pay scales in that grade, which for pay purposes is divided into an upper and a lower half. There is only one commission issued for the whole grade. The act of advancing in pay from the lower to the upper half is merely an administrative one accomplished by a letter from proper authority saying, in effect, that the officer under consideration is now in the upper half of the grade and is entitled to the higher pay scale. If we were to consider that the pay scale in any way affects rank or grade we should have ten different ranks in a captain's grade and ten different ranks in a commander's grade.

Quite to the contrary of this situation, the law recognizes two distinct grades or ranks in brigadier generals and major generals. This same situation prevails in nearly all nations and no one that I know of claims for an instant that these two grades are equal. Separate commissions are issued for these two grades.

In this country we are badly afflicted with the idea of keeping up with the Joneses and sometimes also with what might be called a dog-in-the-manger attitude among ourselves. Both of these ideas seem prevalent in current legislation. It seems that the Navy cannot use commodores in its service for certain well-founded reasons concerning the international situation. This fact has been recognized for many years. Therefore,

a captain in the Navy is promoted directly to the grade of rear admiral.

It seems that the Army insists on keeping brigadier generals for reasons which it vindicates very satisfactorily, so its colonels are advanced to brigadier generals and its brigadier generals to major generals.

Now, naturally, when a Navy captain is commissioned a rear admiral he takes precedence over all brigadier generals regardless of the date of commission, and that is not pleasing to the generals concerned.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield, but I hope the gentleman will give me more time.

Mr. SHORT. In all fairness to the gentleman, would he think it should be pleasing to the general?

Mr. BRADLEY. I see no connection whatever with what the general wants. I consider that rank is the question involved.

Mr. SHORT. A captain in the Navy corresponds to a colonel in the Army.

Mr. BRADLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. When a colonel advances to brigadier general, perhaps at an earlier date than the captain is promoted to rear admiral, still you insist that the rear admiral, even if he receives a rating of the lower half, should take precedence and priority over the brigadier general. I think it is a rank injustice.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think that is the wrong way to look at the situation.

Mr. SHORT. We were willing to correct that, I might say to the gentleman, if the Navy had been willing to reinstate the position of commodore.

Mr. BRADLEY. I see no reason for the Navy adopting the rank of commodore when they have no use for it in the world today.

Mr. SHORT. The Navy wants to eat its cake and have it at the same time.

Mr. BRADLEY. I hope the gentleman will allow me more time because I am going to run short.

To keep up with the Joneses something must be done about this situation. Of course, the Army might drop the grade of brigadier general, but they do not want that solution.

As a consequence, they work out the rather amazing situation we have in this bill—that a brigadier general is equal in rank to the lower half of the rear admirals, while a major general is equal to the upper half of rear admirals, but that the grades of brigadier general and major general are not equal to each other.

It is for that reason that I say we are trying to legislate new principles into mathematics for we are legislatively saying here that things equal to the same thing are not equal to each other.

Now, let us look at the difficulties into which this strange quirk can get us, and into which it will get us. No foreign nation is going to recognize this mental aberration of ours. To foreigners a rear admiral and a major general are of equal grades and a brigadier general is one grade lower. Let us then suppose that we have a rather senior brigadier general ashore in one of our ports and that

we have a rear admiral of the lower half in the same port in his flagship. By this legislation, the brigadier general will be senior to the rear admiral. Then, in comes a foreign warship with a rear admiral on board. The foreigner, let us say, has a date of commission more recent than our own rear admiral and so is junior to him in accordance with international custom. The foreign rear admiral, however, is senior to our brigadier general ashore by any principle which can be applied, for I do not believe that this Nation will attempt to negotiate with other states in an effort to change the generally accepted rules of military seniority—and I do not believe it could succeed in changing these rules even if it did attempt to do so.

Now, we have a pretty situation like this: The American brigadier general is senior to the American rear admiral. The American rear admiral is senior to the foreign rear admiral. The foreign rear admiral is senior to the American brigadier general. Round and round and round she goes—just a pinwheel to which there is no answer while we have such a law on our statute books.

And this situation, Mr. Chairman, can and will be duplicated in many lands under many circumstances to our embarrassment and our chagrin. No one outside the United States will understand this peculiar arrangement. Our diplomats will be in difficulties time after time, and, I predict, will soon be begging for a return to international custom.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for neither the Army nor the Navy, but only in an effort to show what a difficult and peculiar situation this measure would usher in. I hope that some change to bring this into conformity with common custom throughout the world will be accomplished before this bill becomes a law.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions that I would like to ask in view of the fact that we have gone over this bill so rapidly.

I would like to go to page 7 and ask the gentleman from Missouri when this limitation in regard to the number of rear admirals, that is, 150, becomes effective.

Mr. SHORT. We have provided almost a year or a little more than a year, I think it is, until July 1, 1948, for these schedules to go into effect.

Mr. BRADLEY. I believe that to be the case.

Mr. SHORT. We give about a year.

Mr. BRADLEY. The bill is so large that I was unable to ascertain that definitely.

One more question. Will the gentleman from Missouri tell me how this number of 150 was arrived at? This is not merely a useless question, because we are now engaged in writing a bill for the Coast Guard. We have tried to give them the same advantages given to the Navy; so we want to apply the same yardstick.

Mr. SHORT. The number of rear admirals as well as the number of major generals and brigadier generals was arrived at on a percentage basis depending upon the authorized strength of the different services.

Mr. BRADLEY. That is the original number, as I understand it, but how was this 150 arrived at which is obviously

fewer than the number that would be allowed at three-quarters of 1 percent of the total number of officers?

Mr. SHORT. We are not taking three-quarters of 1 percent as the factor, we are taking one-half of 1 percent for both the Army and the Navy. We equalize them.

Mr. BRADLEY. This provision, then, is one-half of 1 percent for permanent legislation?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, for both branches of the service.

Mr. BRADLEY. That is the point I wanted cleared up.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I simply wanted to add that we required the departments to submit to us a list of the posts and billets to which they intended to assign these star officers. We went over the list of billets and assignments and where we thought they were not sufficiently important to have a two-star man in command we cut him out. We went over it with a great deal of care and consultation with the departments, and where we found a rear admiral commanding an atoll in the Pacific we just eliminated him. We went through it very realistically, evaluated the assignment, and applied the percentage basis also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think the members of the committee did a very good job. I am not criticizing the arrangements at all, except the fact that throughout all the world there is international recognition of rank. You cannot change it by any law in this one country. We have tried this at other times, like our neutrality law, and our changes simply blow up as they do not gain international recognition. These customs have been established many centuries. If you want to make two grades of rear admirals, all right; somewhat like the British did at one time when they had rear admirals of the blue and rear admirals of the red; but to my mind it is a very foolish thing. It seems to me to be a mental aberration to say that one-half of a grade is equal to a certain thing and the other half of the same grade is equal to another thing, but that the two things are not equal to each other.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because the gentleman from California in general debate said he had some remarks to make which he hoped would be considered in the other body. I, too, wish to make a few remarks which I hope may be given some consideration in the other body.

I told you a while ago that nobody got everything he asked for in this bill, that the Navy asked for a good many things

that they did not get, the Army asked for a good many things we did not give them, and the Marine Corps asked for a good many things we did not give them. Some, of course, are not satisfied, and this is the first evidence now in the consideration of the bill, but I anticipate additional procedure in the other body, hence my remarks now.

In the Army you have one-star, two-star, three-star, four-star, and, for the time being, five-star generals. In the Navy you have two-star, three-star, four-star, and five-star admirals. There is no one-star officer in the Navy comparable to the brigadier general in the Army. There formerly was a rank of great distinction, a rank held by Admiral Dewey, the rank of commodore, which carried one star, but which was abolished about 50 years ago by the Navy. They went to the system of having rear admirals as their first flag rank. It is one of those situations where we insisted that we were going to put the Army and the Navy in comparable position as to comparable ranks. In a place like Honolulu where the Army and the Navy work together, in the past—and in the future, unless this provision is carried—a brigadier general, who has been a brigadier general for several years, serving on the same post with a naval captain, who has been there the whole time, outranks the naval captain, but when the naval captain is promoted to the next higher rank, that of read admiral, he immediately outranks the brigadier general, notwithstanding the general's longer service. We have tried to wipe out inequalities of that kind for they are the things that act as irritants between the Army and the Navy. Our attempt is to eliminate irritants as far as possible. To me it is a very small thing. It seems to me that a man of sufficient stature to serve as admiral in the Navy or general in the Army should not object to the system we have provided here, simply that among themselves they will rank in accordance with the date on which they receive their stars, whether it is one star or two stars; that is, among themselves, they rank from the date of reaching flag or rank. I see no objection to it, but I do see a great deal of objection to the present system under which a naval officer jumps many numbers of Army officers when he first enters flag rank.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish to ask the gentleman what provision has been or will be made in the law that will take care of these situations in which our officers found themselves during the war when they were assigned to serve on foreign posts with officers of foreign countries. I believe, particularly in the case of the British Government, they assign a rank to the position rather than assign a man of a given rank to serve in that position and invariably they assign a rank to the position which outranks the officers of ours so assigned.

Mr. KILDAY. On this thing of competing with foreign rank, I have a system which I think would work. We can authorize our flag officers to carry two pockets full of stars. Whenever they

are assigned to a station with a foreign officer who always outranks him, he may be authorized to pin on enough stars to outrank the other man.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the finest suggestion I have heard in a long time.

Mr. KILDAY. You will find in dealing with foreign nations that they will always find a man who outranks whoever you have. I do not care what you call our generals and admirals, they will outrank them. So I think ours had better carry a pocketful of stars to be attached for outranking purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is an amendment pending?

Mr. BRADLEY. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a pro forma amendment. The gentleman moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is my understanding that the bill was to be considered read and there was to be only the offering of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a pro forma amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 56, line 21, we find that in the case of a chief of bureau when his term expires "that such a rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau shall upon termination of his tenure as chief of bureau be carried in excess until the next natural vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned."

I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri exactly what is meant by that? What happens if this officer who is kept in the grade of rear admiral after having left the position of chief of a bureau is not selected by the next selection board? We have here an entirely new provision. We have a provision that, if an officer completes his tour of duty as a chief of a bureau, instead of reverting to his original grade he is to be retained in that grade of rear admiral until the time of the next selection board. I do not know how long that would be, possibly 6 months, possibly 2 years; but anyway he is there. What happens to him if he is not selected by the next board?

Mr. SHORT. It is my understanding the admiral comes up for selection at the end of his period of service of 4 years in grade.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think the gentleman misunderstands me. This provision pertains to those officers who have been selected and who have served as chief of a staff bureau. Under present law when a chief of a bureau's term expires he has two things he can do; one, he can drop back to his original grade and continue on active duty; the other is he may retire while in office, keeping his present grade and 75 percent of the pay of the upper half. But here we have a new provision.

Mr. SHORT. What page?

Mr. BRADLEY. Page 56, lines 17 to 21. It is entirely new in naval law, as far as I know.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the gentleman referring to the clause "in excess"?

Mr. BRADLEY. No; I am referring to exactly what this provision says, that upon completion of his term as chief of a bureau he shall retain his grade until the time of the next selection board. What I want to know is what happens to him if he is not selected? Does he go back to his original grade?

Mr. SHORT. He stays in that grade.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then you have set up the Secretary of the Navy as a separate selection board to fill your staff flag grades, because the officer has lost his commission as chief of a bureau. It says "that such a rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau shall upon termination of his tenure as chief of the bureau be carried in excess until the next natural vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned."

Mr. SHORT. That is true, just what it says.

Mr. BRADLEY. When that vacancy occurs, does he get it?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then you have bypassed the Selection Board.

Mr. SHORT. He continues until that vacancy occurs.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then you have completely bypassed the Selection Board, because it had nothing to do with his selection or appointment as chief of bureau. That is what I am driving at. You have set the Secretary of the Navy up as a selection board for that purpose.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the men who have been chiefs of bureau naturally have certain outstanding ability.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am not questioning that for a moment.

Mr. SHORT. Or they would never be made chief.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am not questioning that for a moment; but you have a selection law and you are bypassing it completely, if that is the case.

Perhaps it would be well for me to state specifically my thoughts at this point so any uncertainties may be cleared up before this legislation is passed by both Houses. Under present law, as I understand it, a chief of bureau may be appointed from any grade above lieutenant commander. Upon confirmation by the Senate the officer nominated as chief of bureau attains the rank of rear admiral in the upper half. If this were not the case, then there could be no need of such officer being carried "in excess" after completing his tour of chief of bureau, as he would already have his "number" or place in the list of rear admirals of the corps concerned.

It would seem to me, therefore, from the proviso I have quoted that the intent of the act is merely to allow an ex-chief of bureau to retain his rank of rear admiral until the next natural vacancy. If then selected for that rank, he would attain it permanently. If not selected for that rank, he would automatically revert to his permanent rank in the corps. If the belief of the gentleman from Missouri is correct, as I understand him, in that

this officer would automatically fill the vacancy for which he was waiting, then it seems to me that the purpose of the selection board for staff corps of the Navy will be largely defeated, and, in some instances, such, for example, as in the Civil Engineers Corps and the Chaplain Corps, the whole process of selection by selection boards would come to naught, as the natural flow from the position of chief of bureau would supply enough rear admirals to fill their quotas entirely.

I believe this provision should be clarified to an extent that such possible misunderstandings will be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have been lenient with the gentleman from California, but it is utter folly to try to hold open hearings on this sort of a bill on this floor, and that is all the gentleman has been doing. I will not object at this time, but I shall have to hereafter. We have already granted half a dozen additional extensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. By the method under which this bill is being read, and the way we are going through it, we are not giving the members opportunity to make the comments they desire. If I had appreciated the problem which has arisen I would have objected to the bill being considered in this hasty manner. I feel that each Member of the House has a definite right to be heard.

On page 72, lines 9 to 11, I find a peculiar provision. Would somebody explain that to me? Would the gentleman from Missouri explain to me why a medical corps officer is given 1 year advantage over all others?

Mr. SHORT. Because a medical officer spends one more year in training than a lawyer or chaplain. It takes at least 4 years in the medical university after 4 years in college, after finishing high school, for the ordinary medical officer to graduate, and that is the reason we make that allowance of 4 years. We allow the dentists 3 years and the veterinarian 2 years. Of course, the veterinarian does not apply to the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman. I think we are entitled to that information. That we are entitled to have it spread on the RECORD.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from his long service in the Navy and his close contact with this matter I am sure will realize the difficulty that both services are under today in maintaining their medical complement.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman that I realize it thoroughly, and I do not want to cause any difficulties in the bill.

I have said that I would offer no amendments, but I do think I am en-

titled to answers to some questions which arise when a bill like this is thrown at us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. Are there any amendments to title II? Are there any amendments to title III? Are there any amendments to title IV? Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN:

On page 204, line 22, strike out the word "hereafter."

Page 204, line 24, after the word "may", strike out the words "have been" and insert in lieu thereof the words "hereafter be."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have made a study of this bill, and certainly I think the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle have done well a painstaking job in its preparation. The bill is very comprehensive and is the result of real study by the committee. Certainly, I do not put myself in a position of being more able than the members of this committee in passing judgment on it, nor could I improve on it, generally speaking.

My attention has been called, however, to section 412 wherein the committee has made an attempt to equalize the retirement pay of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. It seems that under the law passed in 1925 the Navy and Marine Corps are authorized to and have permitted certain of its personnel to retire with greater retirement pay when they have received commendation of the Secretary of the Navy for meritorious action in combat. Section 412 of this bill attempts to strike out that inequality between the services. I think it is a wholesome action to place the personnel of all services on an equal basis so far as retirement is concerned. The committee, however, recognizing that certain naval and Marine Corps personnel had already retired under the present law saw fit not to make this provision retroactive insofar as those who have already retired are concerned. My amendment attempts to keep section 412 of this bill from being retroactive as to those now in active service but who have brought themselves within the provision of the act of 1925, in that they hold these commendations. In other words, if this provision—section 412 of the bill—is not amended, it means that certain of those in the Navy and Marine Corps, now on active duty, by retiring before this law gets onto the statute books, can get more retirement pay by quitting, even though the Navy and Marine Corps need them and the men want to stay on, than they can if they stay on and serve 4, 6, or 8 years longer. I think my amendment is in line with what the committee intended, and I hope the committee will see fit to accept it.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi for catching a very significant point. I think his amendment is fair and really does carry out what the committee had in mind. Therefore, it is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MITCHELL: Page 204, line 23, strike out "officers of the Navy, Marine Corps" and insert in lieu thereof "officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard"; and on page 205, strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof: "hereafter granted because of any such commendation: *Provided*, That any officer of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard below the grade of rear admiral or major general who may have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, or the Silver Star Medal shall, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list with the next higher rank or grade than that in which he would otherwise be retired under laws and regulations existing at the time of such retirement, but shall not be granted any increase in pay because of such commendation or such higher rank or grade: *And provided further*, That such officers who have heretofore been or will hereafter be accorded."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to recognize those who distinguished themselves in actual combat with the enemy when our country was at war. The decorations that are mentioned in my amendment are awarded only to those who distinguished themselves by extraordinary heroism in actual conflict with the enemy. This amendment will not place any additional burden upon the taxpayer, as such advance in rank upon retirement is simply honorary. For instance, a captain in the Army would retire with the rank of major, or a colonel in the Marine Corps would retire as a brigadier general, as the case may be. They still would draw the retired pay of captain or colonel, but would have been accorded the honor of holding the next higher rank on the retired list. Such an honor is little enough recognition for the sacrifices and devotion to country and duty that they must necessarily have given to have been awarded such combat commendation.

I am certain my colleagues on both sides of the House will support this amendment and thereby prove that our memories are not too short lived.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This is exactly what has been done with the Regular Navy officers, is it not? The gentleman wants to make this apply to all officers whether they are Regular officers or Reserve officers?

Mr. MITCHELL. All officers who can qualify under the requirements of those four commendations, yes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think my colleague from Indiana has made a very excellent statement and has made a good case. I shall be glad to support his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I hold the same view with regard to the gentleman's amendment. Let me ask him this question, to be sure: These four decorations the gentleman has referred to and which are mentioned in the gentleman's amendment are those given for valor or extraordinary heroism in combat only?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The only effect of this amendment is that a captain in the Navy, let us say, who had received one of these decorations, when he came to retire would retire with the title of rear admiral but not with the pay of a rear admiral?

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the adoption of the amendment one way or another is highly important and I am somewhat embarrassed to speak on it. I recognize the position of many present Representatives in this Congress, new Members, who served with the armed services in this war, in combat, front-line service, and gave valorous service. I speak as a recipient of one of these decorations in World War I. I have never believed that anyone so rewarded should receive any recognition beyond that, for it is my opinion that for every one who receives a Congressional Medal of Honor, a Distinguished Service Cross, a Silver Star, or what not, there are 10 or 20 more who rightfully should receive them.

Any action in the adoption of this amendment is highly preferential to one of many who rendered equally valorous service.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think perhaps there is much truth in what the gentleman says, but would not the same thing be true of the award of the medal itself?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That may be true.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The gentleman would certainly not suggest that we should stop the award of the medal; would he?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No; I would not, but let it be on no other basis.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I would say as a recipient of two of these medals that I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman from New York has said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 34, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 206 of the bill, lines 7 to 10, we find the provision which allows three four-star admirals for the Navy. We listened to a statement some time ago which might lead you to believe that is the same condition which has prevailed for some time. Mr. Chairman, this is not the same condition. There has never been a time that I can recall since 1916 that the Navy has not had four four-star admirals. These have been assigned as commander in chief of the Atlantic, commander in chief of the Pacific, chief of operations, and commander in chief, Asiatic. That assignment has been changed from time to time and indicates the need of flexibility in this measure, but there is no such flexibility here.

In this particular measure, we find one of these four-star grades taken away from the line of the Navy where it has been for more than 30 years and given to the Marine Corps. Now, I have no objection whatever to the Marine Corps having such a grade, but I see no reason why one such position should be taken away from the Navy. I cannot see why the Navy with some 40,000 officers does not need as much rank now as when it had only about ten or twelve thousand officers. But now we are taking one of these four-star officers away from the Navy—actually reducing the number in this rank below prewar figures.

The fact of the matter is, as I see it, that the Navy should have a minimum of five four-star officers, one for Chief of Operations, one for the Atlantic, one for the Pacific, and two that they could send wherever they are needed, probably one to European and one to Asiatic waters. I cannot see any objection to that idea.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield gladly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that this matter has been the subject of conferences on the part of Mr. Vinson, myself, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, and the professional heads of all three services. I want to recall to the gentleman's attention that the Navy has approximately 400,000 men in the service and the Army 1,000,000. The Army is limited in this bill to four four-star generals, with 1,000,000 men; the Navy, including the Marine Corps, four four-star admirals, with only 500,000 men. The committee has agreed to equalize the services and this amendment has the complete approval of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the full membership of the personnel subcommittee; and, finally, of the departments themselves.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am glad to have the gentleman give this information. That does not, however, in any way prevent a Member of the House from expressing his own personal opinion, which I am doing now and which I want to see in the Record.

One more thing as we go along. I notice that nothing in this legislation

preserves the rank held by our battle commanders during the war in either the Army or the Navy. It is not to be expected that these battle commanders will be given any of these particular posts assigned in the bill. Therefore, all of your battle commanders, the top officers who went out and fought and won the war will stand to be put back in grade on July 1, 1948, if some provision is not passed before that time to assist them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. Gladly.

Mr. SHORT. I, of course, appreciate the gentleman's views. As I stated in my original remarks, the committee was very reluctant to reduce the rank of these heroes who contributed so much to winning the war; but the officers of lower grade, the captains, have already taken a reduction. General Dahlquist, who was the War Department's representative in this regard, was a major general and commanded a combat division in Europe, a Texas division. He has already been reduced, after a most excellent record, to brigadier general. He was willing to take his reduction in rank.

I want to repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, if a colonel is reduced to major and a major is reduced to captain, how is it going to hurt to reduce a lieutenant general to a major general, or a vice admiral to an admiral? We feel that the reduction should be all across the board and all down the line.

Mr. BRADLEY. I hope the gentleman will give me some more time.

Mr. SHORT. We certainly will have no objection to the gentleman's asking for more time.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments; I thank him sincerely. I am merely trying to do what has been done down through the entire history of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. The same thing has been done right down through the history of the United States from the beginning of our existence as a Nation. It has been done in almost every other country in the world. The men who have commanded in battle and won the wars have been given some reward.

I am advised informally that there will probably be no objection in many quarters to passing legislation designed to permit these top battle commanders to keep their rank, and so prevent their going on the retired list at a reduced rank for a few weeks or a few months.

I merely want to make this a matter of record so it can be seen that we have not missed the point as we have gone by.

I do not believe the American people are going to see their top battle commanders reduced in grade for a matter of a few months or days before they retire.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that many of the commanders on the ships were Reserve officers?

Mr. BRADLEY. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They will be reduced, I suppose, to the rank even of second lieutenant in the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that Reserve officers commanded small ships and transports. I do not believe any Reserve officer commanded any of the larger combat ships.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from California feel that the Navy has had a chance to tell its story? I do not feel that before the Expenditures Committee the Navy perhaps has been allowed to speak. I feel that the Navy itself is gagged.

Mr. BRADLEY. I have no feeling that the Navy has been gagged in any way by the Armed Services Committee. I feel they gave them a full hearing. There are differences of opinion, however, as I am showing right now by my comments.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to hear my colleague from California make that remark because we really gave the Navy more time than we gave the Army. In fact, I am beginning to suspect that the Navy told us one thing in the committee but has been telling something different on the outside.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that they do not have to tell me anything about the Navy. I have served in the Navy long enough to know what conditions are and what I think would be right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from California has served many years in the Navy. The Navy had its full share of time before the committee. The gentleman knows that they are for this bill wholeheartedly and they are not in any way backtracking on anything they said in the hearings in my opinion.

Mr. BRADLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I rather doubt that there is as complete approval as he indicates. As I have said repeatedly, however, I am speaking my own opinions to get them in the RECORD because this is what I believe. I believe every Member of the House should do likewise when he feels such to be advisable.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 224, line 24, after the comma follow-

ing the word "corps", insert the words "in the Judge Advocate General Corps"; and on page 225, line 2, after the last comma, insert the words "Judge Advocate General Corps"; and at the end of line 6, add the words "general officers, Judge Advocate General Corps, Regular Army."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to secure for the Judge Advocate General's Corps recognition the same as the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Chaplains' Corps and other corps which are considered separate from the Regular Army. The reason I have offered this amendment is because I happen to be a member of a subcommittee which this day reported to the full committee a bill which has to do with the Judge Advocate General's Department. The majority of the committee who were present favored the setting up of the Judge Advocate General's Department as a separate branch of the service.

The reason for that is that the testimony has clearly shown that in wartime more than 90 percent of the business of the Judge Advocate General's Department has to do with legal matters. Line officers are not needed in this Department in any way, shape or manner; therefore, it seems unfortunate that this Department should be mixed up with line officers or officers who have to do with the actual handling of troops or of supplies for the Army. It is purely a legal proposition, just as the Medical Corps has to do with medical matters. There is a little administration in the Medical Corps, similarly in the Judge Advocate General's Department. As I see it, we have had a lot of courts martial. We have had considerable talk by veterans' organizations setting forth that during the course of the war these courts martial were not in all cases properly handled. By setting up the Judge Advocate General's branch as a separate corps I think that we will be meeting the feelings of the leaders of the various veterans' organizations and the various bar associations throughout the country, including the American Bar Association. As a matter of fact, not a single person appeared as a witness, outside of the War Department, either in connection with the Judge Advocate's Department bill or this promotion bill, who favored placing the Judge Advocate General's Department in the Regular Army. Each and every one of these witnesses, outside of the War Department, favored the setting up of the Judge Advocate General's Department as a separate branch. In view of the fact that it has to be solely with legal matters, it is not expected that these officers shall take part in drills or in the handling of troops or have any connection with fighting except under most extraordinary circumstances. It seems to me, therefore, that we ought to follow the viewpoint of the veterans who believe they are entitled to have lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's Department looking out for the enlisted men who are in trouble, also to follow the viewpoint of the bar associations all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, these people testified that they have been working for days

and for months in an attempt to improve the Judge Advocate General's department. To throw aside their views as expressed in countless resolutions and in several documents many pages long which have been submitted to the committee would be an unfortunate act on the part of the House here this afternoon. By setting up the Judge Advocate General's department as a separate branch like the Medical Corps, I cannot see how anyone having to do with the fighting branch of the Army is in any way affected adversely. Certainly if we are going to run the department as it should be, they could not be expected to be assigned to the Judge Advocate General's department.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Did the report of the committee of the Secretary of War that studied the question of military justice and revision of the Articles of War recommend that the Judge Advocate branch be a separate branch in line with the Medical Corps and the others?

Mr. CLASON. They have taken a position on this promotion bill which wipes out the Judge Advocate General's department as a separate service, but every person who has been connected with the Army in the past and who is now a veteran, and every leading lawyer in the country, as near as I can find out, favors it as a separate branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite right in his understanding of the work being done by the Armed Services Committee on the so-called military justice bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is a member of the subcommittee; the chairman of which is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]. I think it is tacitly agreed, at least by myself and also the leadership on the committee, that if and when the War Department-Justice bill is completed and referred by our committee to the House and acted upon, and if it sets up a separate JAG department, the promotion bill as finally acted upon in the Senate will be changed accordingly. This is no time to bring the matter up from the subcommittee, which has not been approved by the full committee on the floor of the House, and expect the House to alter a bill upon which the full committee has not finally acted.

I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I am wholly in sympathy with everything that has been done in the subcommittee insofar as reforming the procedure of military justice and what he said about the Judge Advocate's department. If and when the military-justice bill reaches the floor and is acted upon favorably by the House and the Senate, there is a proper way and a very easy way to bring about a correction, but this is definitely not the time to attempt to do it, and the motion should be defeated.

Mr. CLASON. In view of the statement made by my very able chairman, for whom I have the very highest respect, and if the membership is willing, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. GOFF. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have on the Clerk's desk an amendment providing for the creation of a separate promotion list for the Judge Advocate General's department, but if I may have the time to inquire of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, perhaps I shall not offer it.

Mr. Chairman, in continuation of the colloquy we just had on the last amendment presented before it was voted on, the gentleman stated that the committee had in mind amending the promotion bill that we have before the House today as soon as the report of the subcommittee studying military justice had submitted its report to the main committee; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The military justice bill has not been reported by the subcommittee to the full committee of the Armed Services as yet, and therefore, has not been reported to the House. It is presumed that some day the military-justice bill will be acted upon by the House. It is quite apparent that the promotion bill will not be acted upon by the Senate for quite a while, but in any event the Army military-justice bill can be written amending the promotion bill, if necessary, or the promotion bill in the Senate, or when it is agreed upon in conference, can be further amended accepting such amendments as may be necessary on the basis of the Army military court martial.

Mr. GOFF. Does the gentleman expect the military-justice bill to be reported out this session?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am informed that they have agreed upon a bill today. I might say they have been working on it for 4 months, and I am heartily in sympathy with everything that has been done, and so is a large majority of the membership of the House. The gentleman might direct his question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], who is the ranking minority Member of that committee.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that subcommittee was in session this morning and did complete the bill, and we will be able to report it to the full committee at its next meeting which I expect will be next Tuesday, if not before. I do not know, of course, what action the full committee may take on it. The subcommittee has written the bill and completed its work.

Mr. GOFF. Then I take it that the promotion bill will be acted upon this session by the Senate.

Mr. KILDAY. I would not attempt to predict what action the other body might take, due to recent experience. If both of these bills go through, the last to go

through could certainly amend the one that went through ahead of it.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances I shall not offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 253, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1371) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, after "permanent", insert "or temporary."

Page 2, line 8, after "permanent", insert "or temporary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2276) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of War and

the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to direct the training and attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, as participants in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and future Olympic games: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is further authorized to direct the training and attendance of animals of the Army of the United States for such games: *Provided further*, That the expenses in amounts not to exceed \$75,000 for the Army and \$50,000 for the Navy, incident to the training, attendance, and participation in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games, including the use of such supplies, material, and equipment as in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, may be necessary, may be charged to the appropriations for the support of the Army and appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, respectively, for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949: *And provided further*, That applicable allowances which are or may be fixed by law or regulations for participation in other military activities shall not be exceeded."

Amend the title so as to read as follows: "An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games."

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL PLANTATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1358) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "section 2 of."
Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 1. Hereafter the appropriations for the subsistence of Army and Navy personnel, respectively, shall be available for any and all expenditures necessary in the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any plantation or farm, on land subject to Army or Navy jurisdiction outside of the continental United States, for the purpose of furnishing fresh fruits and vegetables to the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That equipment, material, and supplies required therein may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and other laws applicable to purchases by governmental agencies: *Provided further*, That only American nationals, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, benefits, or obligations of civilian employees of the United States: *Provided further*, That surplus production over the amount furnished, or sold to the armed forces of the United States and to civilians serving with

the armed forces may only be sold outside the continental limits of the United States: *And provided further*, That no land shall be acquired under this authorization."

Page 2, line 3, after "end", insert "the Secretary of War, with respect to Army affairs, and."

Page 2, line 3, after "Navy", insert ", with respect to Navy affairs."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "naval or" and insert "Army, Navy, or."

Page 2, line 9, after "of", insert "the Secretary of War, in regard to Army matters, and."

Page 2, line 10, after "Navy", insert ", in regard to Navy matters."

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE—MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1375) to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "the", where it occurs the first time, insert "Army."

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AN INTERSTATE PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, today, in the city of Walla Walla, Wash., a hearing is being held by the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee to consider arguments concerning a proposal from the Secretary of the Interior to impose a 10-year moratorium on the construction of any new dams on the lower reaches of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

This proposal, made at the behest of certain interests in the Northwest and objected to violently by certain other interests, constitutes a major crisis in the long series of events which have marked the steady but uncoordinated development of that region of our Nation comprising the drainage area of the Columbia River system. The decision on that proposal, whether it be affirmed, or rejected, or modified, may well be the key to the future unity or embittered separation of the forces concerned with developing the resources of the Columbia region.

It is for that reason that I have chosen this date to introduce into this Eightieth Congress a bill to create a Columbia Interstate Commission, a corporation under which the chosen representatives of the four Pacific Northwest States and the Federal Government would enter into a compact to undertake the planning, promotion, and operation of the orderly, progressive development of the Columbia River region.

I consider this to be the logical time for the residents of the Pacific Northwest States to unite on a firm basis by joining their representative State governments and their native private enterprise with the several agencies of the Federal Government and to assume command of their own destiny. I earnestly ask that the Members of this Congress and all parties concerned give full consideration and study to this proposal before coming to any judgment upon it and that they move toward its enactment prior to the adoption of such a far-reaching decision as the proposed 10-year moratorium on new lower Columbia construction.

NOT AN AUTHORITY

The purpose of creating the Columbia Interstate Commission is to provide a vehicle for the orderly development of the tremendous resources with which this region has been blessed, to give voice to the residents of the Pacific Northwest States in determining the policies directing that development, to protect and extend the benefits of that development to the growth of the true native private enterprise in that area, and to guarantee to the Federal Government an orderly program for the liquidation of the tremendous investments it has made and is being asked to make in the Northwest.

This is not a "valley authority" bill. It does not contemplate the setting up of an autocratic government agency empowered to plan and regulate the economic life of the entire region. It does not present a blueprint for full-scale development.

The bill does recognize the need for a statutorily recognized interstate agency, responsible to the will of the people residing in the Columbia River region and empowered to develop a program and policy consistent with the needs and desires of the people themselves. It attempts to locate the necessary authority involved as closely to the people of that area as is constitutionally possible.

INTERSTATE PROBLEM

The Columbia River is both an interstate and an international stream. With its 73 tributaries, it drains large areas of western Montana, Wyoming, nearly all of Idaho, part of British Columbia, and well over 50 percent of both Oregon and Washington.

Those familiar with the potentialities and characteristics of this river realize that any construction, regulation, or other action taken at any point along its course has a definite and related effect upon the entire waterway. For that reason, no one State nor any portion of any State can be allowed to exercise an arbitrary control over its flow. In addition, the water-storage and watershed-protection features in the higher levels are

necessary components of the power, flood-control, and navigation systems in the broad reaches below.

This problem has long been recognized. The Governors of the States affected, several years ago, saw fit to get together and discuss their mutual problems and their mutual benefits in the Columbia. This present bill is designed to give them a practical share in the solution of those problems and the determination of the policies to be followed regarding development of their several States.

A second move in the proper direction was the formation of all Federal agencies concerned with resources development into the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee. While this move tended to achieve a coordination of effort between the existing Federal agencies, it has been notably and severely lacking in that it retained absolute policy control in the hands of those agencies and did not allow practical participation in policy-making on the part of the residents of the region affected.

The effect of the CIC bill would be to bridge the gap left by those two moves.

NEED MORE LOCAL CONTROL

During the past year or so, there has been a tendency on the part of those who fear the dangers of a collectivized valley authority for the Columbia region to protest that they favor entrusting the development of the river to "existing agencies."

But what are these "existing agencies" that they should be so jealously protected in their position?

Do they represent the people who live in the Columbia region?

Are they responsible to the residents of the Columbia drainage area?

I should like to remind those who speak in dread of collectivization that for 119 years the Federal jurisdiction over the rivers of this Nation has increased—and the "existing agencies" are the arms of that jurisdiction.

As the courts now interpret the commerce clause in the Federal Constitution, our central Government has final authority over a river system from the ocean to the upper end of the last brook in any watershed. That clause simply provides: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States and with the Indian tribes."

We, today, find ourselves engulfed in Federal jurisdiction—yet those who claim to fear that very condition most are today its paradoxical defenders.

I believe that we should pause and review what has been done. We should take stock lest the juggernaut of our own creation crush valuable units of local and State government which we should cherish and protect.

I do not by any means oppose the proper part the Federal Government must play in any river development. There are provinces of authority which must be reserved to the Federal jurisdiction. What I here advocate is the additional playing of the full part of the peoples of the States themselves in this picture, for ours is still a Union of States.

PROTECTS PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The CIC bill provides for the utilization of every Federal agency in the de-

velopment of reclamation, navigation, flood control, pollution control and all of the other benefits which flow from our intelligent development of the Columbia. I have also tried to take full advantage of the existing agencies within the States, as, for instance, the Columbia Basin Commission in the State of Washington which for years has served as a model for intelligent State participation in natural-resource development.

The bill calls for creation of a Federal Corporation, with headquarters located in the region and properly respecting the existence and rights of the States themselves. It also provides for making the benefits of resource-development available to private industry and the protection of existing private industry in the region.

The CIC would consist of a five-man Commission, appointed by the President, four of whose members would be nominated by the governors of the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana. The fifth member would be appointed at large. In addition, there would be an advisory council of 33, including the governors of the four States, plus the directors of conservation and development of those four States and the State of Wyoming. The Columbia system drains only a small portion of Wyoming, hence its representation is reduced.

The remaining members of the Advisory Council would be six additional members from each of the four States. The suggestion is that Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, should form Columbia Basin commissions, on a nonpartisan basis, similar to that already existing in Washington, and that the members of these commissions would be the representatives on the Advisory Council.

This Advisory Council would have basic control over the determination of policies and programs to be presented to Congress for approval, the payment of debts and of moneys in lieu of taxes to State and local governments, the priority relationship of projects and the like.

SELF-SUPPORTING

It is contemplated that all projects to be undertaken by the CIC will be self-liquidating. The commission would act as an independent corporation under the Federal Administration and would be required to reimburse the United States Treasury for every loan or appropriation made to it by the Federal Government.

There are two major stages in the development of a river system. The first is the planning and construction of the physical properties. This is the stage of decision, of which today's meeting at Walla Walla in the State of Washington is a vital part. The second is the stage of operation which begins after the projects are built. In the case of the Columbia, we have already entered upon some phases of the second stage while still in the midst of the first.

During both of these stages, however, it is tremendously important that the united or conflicting interests of the people living in the affected area be given just consideration. During the first stage, major sacrifices must be made by

some persons in order to clear the way for a new project. In the second stage, continued watch must be maintained that the original purposes of the development are achieved, that the Federal investment is reimbursed to the Treasury and that the project is not subjected to controls or manipulation contrary to the best interests of the people.

FISHERIES RIGHTS

As an example, the fundamental reason for the proposed moratorium on new dam construction being considered today at Walla Walla is the demand on the part of the fishing industry that it be given sufficient time to rehabilitate the multimillion dollar salmon spawning grounds to new downstream locations. The interests of the fishing industry certainly are valid and it has a right to its proper measure of protection. On the other hand, if the majority of the people of the region are determined to have other features of their one great natural resource, the Columbia, developed, there must be provision made that both ends, if at all possible, can be achieved.

This is a perfect example, in my estimation, of the kind of Solomon's justice which must be exercised in determining the progress of a river program. The capitalized value of the Columbia fishing industry amounts to more than \$100,000,000 and accounts for an annual operation of from seven to ten million dollars, not to mention the number of persons dependent on it for their livelihood. While those who desire the early completion of navigation and power improvements on the lower Columbia and Snake Rivers have much in their favor, this investment in the fishing industry constitutes a value which should not lightly be discarded.

We have made strides of progress in this line. Through cooperation of many agencies and with private efforts, much has been learned and much accomplished in the perfection of fish ladders, transplantation of spawning grounds, clearing of downstream beds, pollution control, and other measures.

But we have not yet solved the question of how long navigation must wait for adequate solution of these problems.

Who are better qualified to make such an all-important decision—the appointed officials of the Federal administrative agencies at the Nation's Capital or the duly-designated representatives of the people who live in the Columbia region?

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

There is another important purpose in the creation of a Columbia Interstate Commission. Today, there are some 17 different Government agencies concerned with the development of the Columbia River. Each of these must represent itself separately before the Congress of the United States. Many of them appear before several different committees of the Houses of Congress.

Passage of this bill would make it possible for the Members of Congress to review the entire question of Columbia River development through one legislative committee, thereby gaining a full and accurate picture of the work done, the policies followed, the financial operations, and the relationship of this inte-

grated activity to the entire governmental structure.

This improvement would be noted also in the representation before Congress by the several private associations which maintain interests in resource development.

Our experiences in this present session have amply demonstrated the amount of misinformation about the various phases of developmental activity which have been injected into the hearings of the several legislative committees by many of these private organizations, each guarding its own interest and often attempting to sabotage others.

ATOMIC ENERGY

A prime example of this experience is one of the arguments used by the representatives of the fishing industry in calling for the 10-year moratorium. Using a number of scientific articles written for popular consumption in national magazines as the basis of their contention, the fisheries people have stated that after 10 years it would be senseless to build any further dams across the Columbia for the purpose of generating electric power "because everybody knows that before the 10-year period is over, atomic energy will be producing electricity more cheaply than either steam or hydroelectric plants."

Because of the far-reaching implications of this argument, I took the trouble last week to ask the highest authority on the subject in this country, the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, whether there was any possibility of having the feasibility or pay-out ability or other values of the proposed hydroelectric projects on the Columbia River diminished or nullified by reason of progress in the development of electric power through atomic energy.

The answer I received from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission was as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1947.

House of Representatives,
HON. WALT HORAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: Your letter of June 11 has been received and studied by the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. The questions which you have raised about the time required for the development of atomic power to the point where it is a major competitor with other sources of electrical power are difficult to answer in detail.

We have no doubt that the long-range future of atomic power is bright but believe the process will in general be one of gradually supplementing rather than replacing other means of generating electrical power.

It is very likely that the first commercial installations for atomic power will be in locations with inadequate access to coal and economical water power.

As to the particular question you put, while it is not prudent to make firm predictions about the rate of development in an industry which is so new, we believe it unlikely that atomic power presents any serious question of rendering obsolete Columbia River power within the predictable future.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman.

In addition to the statements contained in the above letter, I am advised on responsible authority which I believe

to be competent, that it is extremely doubtful, in the light of present knowledge, whether the production of electric energy through the application of atomic power will be made feasible and economical enough to compete with Columbia hydropower within the next 25 years.

Indeed, one of the most important men concerned with the study and application of atomic energy has stated that atomically generated electric power probably never will become feasibly anything more than a supplement to present methods of generation. In spite of this, irresponsible persons even in the northwest have been not above using such specious arguments before the committees of Congress to further their ends in frustration of the common good.

Clearly, then, there is a need for the establishment of a responsible agency to sift through the maze of such conflicting statements and present an official, authoritative case for orderly Northwest development to the Senators and Representatives of the Nation here in Washington.

INTERIM PROPOSALS

In summing up all these considerations, I am today asking the Congress and the people of the United States to look upon this proposal as a restatement of the proper relationship of an American Government and its people as applied to the development of river resources in general and to the Columbia River region in particular.

Pending consideration of this bill, I am hereby asking the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, in its meeting at Walla Walla, to study the following proposals:

First. First priority should be given to continued progress and early completion of those phases of Columbia-region development which have already been started, including installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam, construction of the Columbia Basin irrigation project, Hungry Horse Dam, McNary Dam, the upstream developments in Idaho and Montana, and the Detroit project in Oregon.

Second. Every facility at the disposal of the Federal and State governments of the States concerned and every effort of private enterprise should be directed toward the relocation of the salmon spawning grounds, the improvement of downstream fishways, and such other measures as will best protect the fishing industry from the effects of future dam construction.

Third. Such proceedings as may be necessary should be instituted through the Office of Indian Affairs to make reasonable and just settlement with the Indians replacing the terms of the treaties regarding fishing rights, whereby those treaties no longer would constitute a bar to future river development.

Fourth. The proposed moratorium on construction of new dams across the Columbia below its confluence with the Okanogan River and on the Snake below its juncture with the Salmon should be placed in effect for a period of not more than 2 years from this date, pending action on the part of the Congress on the proposed creation of a Columbia Inter-

state Commission, and, after the expiration of that time, if such Commission has been created and is in operation, it should become the responsibility of the Commission, subject to the approval of the Congress, to determine whether the moratorium should be prolonged or lifted. If the Congress has failed to create the CIC, the Inter-Agency Committee shall present to the Congress all information obtained as a result of its surveys and hearings and the decision shall be left with the Congress.

It is my belief that these proposals constitute the best possible compromise in the interests of the general public of the Pacific Northwest.

PROFIT BY EXPERIENCE

This Nation of ours is a Union of States. Each of those States is composed of people—people who have vital interests in every proposal and every decision that is made regarding the area in which they live. I consider it to be in the American tradition that those people resident in an area retain the maximum degree of control over the policies and government of their native region.

Our National Government, now at the urging of this Congress going through the painful process of decentralization to local controls after a hectic few years of rigid, centralized, and bureaucratic administration, can well profit by fully recognizing the existence of States as such and by working with them as partners in interstate compacts such as the CIC.

During the recent war the people of the Northwest experienced the benefits of a working partnership on the part of private industry, the local and State authorities, and the Federal Government when they banded together all of their electrical generation and distribution facilities into the Northwest power pool. This partnership successfully carried the tremendous loads of the war effort in the Pacific Northwest and at the same time demonstrated that private industry and Government can work side by side, provided the proper ground rules are laid down and the rightful interests of each are safeguarded.

It was the war that served to point out the crucial role the Columbia River could play in the destiny of all of us. It was the war that showed us how to work together to our mutual benefit without the loss of those traditional concepts which make up the American way of doing things.

Let us now strive to accept those lessons in time of peace and utilize them as the basis for a means of cooperation among friends and neighbors that will glorify the progress of our future years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

MR. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

MR. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I advocate greater support and a better public understanding of the fine work which is being done by our United States Maritime Commission. This body is often

accused of too strenuous agitation in behalf of merchant marine development, and I fear that for that reason its recommendations are often discounted. My observance, however, is that it is a highly skilled and competent agency, which did an excellent war job under tremendous difficulties, and is now in the process of perfecting a compact and efficient post-war organization. It is actually the only Government spokesman for our merchant marine, and is the only available advocate for it in high places. In my humble opinion, the importance of the merchant marine, and our maritime future as a Nation warrants a Cabinet post for this subject alone.

A part of my congressional district lies in the great port of Baltimore, which is now the second largest in volume of foreign commerce handled. Observing the expanding operations of that international harbor, and noting the dependency of a city of a million people on the activities of its port, has given me a new appreciation of the vital importance of a healthy and prosperous American merchant marine to the future of our national economy; in fact, its national significance perhaps is even greater than its local and area importance.

I wish time would permit me to fully outline the facilities and advantages of the port of Baltimore, for, I feel that it stands out as a great symbol of our national dependency on shipping and on merchant marine stability and progress. In addition to the volume of business handled, it is one of the world's leading ship construction and repair centers, and many of the vast fleet of ships which annually visit Baltimore take advantage of this modern equipment, and the efficiency and economy with which it is operated. Besides 10 private shipbuilding and repair plants there is the United States Coast Guard yard at Curtis Bay, where extensive and efficient repair work and construction of small craft has been a major endeavor for many years.

This great shipbuilding and repair industry at Baltimore, as well as in our other ports, is threatened with extinction unless our country embarks at once on an aggressive program of merchant-marine development. Unless and until our Government clarifies its merchant-marine program, it is likely that by next year there will be no merchant shipbuilding. Men with experience and skills will be diverted into other activities, and when we have need for them in another emergency there may not even be a nucleus around which a shipbuilding program could be built.

A port means a great deal to the economy and industry of the city and surrounding area; and by the same standards the American merchant marine means a great deal to America.

The world has seen many changes, and the most consistent have been in trade and warfare. In peace as well as war, the outstanding nation in every age has been the one with the biggest and most effective battle and commercial fleet. From the early Greek legends, we know that the Cretans lost the sea lanes in a great naval disaster in about 1400 B. C., and from that time down through the ages, through the Phoenicians, the

Carthaginians, the Romans, Persians, Greeks, and through the history of Venice, Turkey, Portugal, Spain, the Dutch, and the French—as each of these nations lost its foothold in the sea lanes, it lost its place in the sun. Through no aggressive steps on our part, we now occupy that place in the sun, and with that comes many responsibilities we might heretofore have ignored or at best quibbled over. An adequate merchant-marine fleet is one of these responsibilities, if we are to safeguard and keep sound this Nation of ours, and fulfill our obligations toward keeping world peace.

We have found it necessary to advance foreign loans. This is one step in our pursuit for world peace; our Army and Navy constitute another factor; and our merchant marine fleet—which in peace or war cannot be separated from our Navy—not only helps to supply and advance our own economy, but ties in with the general over-all picture of our foreign policy.

We must not, in justice to our own economy and world peace, permit our merchant marine to deteriorate and disintegrate as it did after the First World War, while we are indirectly subsidizing with our money through these foreign loans, the construction and operation of our competitors' merchant ships, most of which are completely subsidized.

We must have a stable program and stick to it, and, not as we have been doing in the past, treat our merchant marine as a favorite son during emergencies and as a step-child in between. At the beginning of the First World War shipbuilding was at such a low ebb that the vast bulk of our men and munitions had to be transported in foreign ships. That emergency produced a spurt of activity, followed by a negative interest, which dwindled to such an extent as to make us trail our competitors in shipping. In spite of our tremendous output and unequalled record attained during the last war, the immediate outlook for shipbuilding in this country is at present more ominous than at any time since before the outbreak of World War I.

These uncertainties and constant changes of policies have had their effects upon the industry, and, to my mind, it is vital that the Congress adopt a sound, coordinated, long-range ship-building program. If the policy is stabilized, fluctuation in the industry would be eliminated; technical staffs, vital to the development of marine architecture and marine engineering, would be preserved; and the employment level of merchant seamen would become more stable. Stabilized employment is important to those many merchantmen who follow the seas as a livelihood, and continued, uninterrupted movement of ships is necessary to the over-all industry in this highly competitive field.

America's leadership on the seas, achieved during the recent war, is rapidly disappearing. Our merchant marine of 56,000,000 tons at the end of the recent war is now down to about thirty million, and decreasing fast. A report, which reached me not long ago, showed that only 64 new ships are under construction in this country, with 14 of them

destined for foreign owners. At the same time, Great Britain was building 454 new ships, Holland 91, Italy 87, and Sweden 66, which, as above stated, are being indirectly subsidized with our foreign loans.

The United States still leads the merchant-marine parade with about 30,000,000 gross tons of shipping now in service, compared with the 8,000,000 gross tons we had in 1939. But I am informed that over half of the more than 3,000 ships in our fleet are due to be laid up with 2 years, at the present rate of decline. Also, the percentage of American goods carried on American ships is rapidly declining. I believe our ships now carry about 75 percent of United States exports and about 70 percent of our imports, but at the way things are going now the prospect is that we will be carrying well below the 50 percent of exports and imports within the next couple of years.

I am afraid that United States shipping concerns see little hope of holding their own against lower-cost merchant fleets of other nations, either in freight or passenger carriage, without substantial Government aid. Operating costs are often 100 percent or more above those of the ships of other nations. The costs of building and operating American ships have tripled, in many cases, which those of foreign fleets have become perceptibly less.

I know we do not like the word "subsidy" in this country, but I see no other course for us to pursue than to give such Federal aid in both construction and operation that will at least let us come within striking distance of foreign competition. It is a form of national insurance, in that it would protect our own national economy and security, as well as world peace; and it must be considered as such rather than the hand-out which the word always seems to imply to Americans.

In the black picture which faces American shipyards today, one of the most encouraging signs is the appointment by the President of the Advisory Committee for it indicates at least the awakening of a national recognition of the importance of this subject to America's welfare.

I was impressed by the statement submitted on May 21st last to this Advisory Committee by Mr. Frazier A. Bailey, the new president of the National Federation of American Shipping, which represents about 90 percent of deep-water American passenger and cargo lines. His views reflect the opinions of practical men, and I am inclined to go along with his recommendation that our construction differential be frozen at the present legal maximum of 50 percent, and that it be extended to American ships in both foreign and domestic trades. The latter extension seems to me to be vital because of the requirements of national security in making available military and naval auxiliaries, as well as the preservation of the Nation's shipbuilding facilities, organizations and craftsmen.

It seems to me high time that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 should be clarified and strengthened.

Congress should give attention to the statement of June 1, 1947, by the National Foreign Trade Council, which pointed out that over a 9-year period total subsidies paid to shipping lines was less than the Government outlay in support of such items as coffee and butter during one recent year. This organization showed conclusively that a sound merchant marine is a necessity in the promotion of foreign trade as it is to the national defense; and in giving its support to Government merchant marine subsidies effectively disposed of the theory that foreign-flag lines ought to be allowed to carry more American goods in order to permit their countries to earn more dollars to spend in this country. In denying the contention that present shipping rates are too high, the council also showed that the rates of one American line increased only 60 percent from January 1, 1926, to December 31, 1946, while operating costs had risen 213 percent. Such statements should not be interpreted as depreciation of the value of foreign shipping to our ports and to our foreign trade. These foreign-owned and operated ships are welcome visitors to our shores, and play a substantial part in furthering our maritime activity. However, they do indicate very clearly the main point at issue: That we must have a self-sufficient and independent merchant marine of our own if we are to be adequately protected in respect to our national defense and world trade. Opportunity is knocking at our door, but the raps are getting fainter. This is the zero hour for the American merchant marine. Never before has our opportunity been so great to prevent a catastrophe and to assure an adequate merchant marine future, in which American ships will have their just share of world-wide commerce, and maintain their rightful and dominant position on the trade routes of the seas.

H. R. 3647

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to take up for consideration the bill (H. R. 3647) with 1 hour of general debate and the bill to be then read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 225, which makes in order House Joint Resolution 207, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor. That after general debate,

which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and now yield myself such time as may be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in an anomalous position on this question in asking the House to approve a rule on a bill about which I am quite doubtful. I discussed the provisions of this measure at some length with the chairman of the subcommittee which reported it, our good friend and colleague [Mr. VORYS] and apparently I did not understand at the time I discussed it with him just what the bill did.

However, yesterday and this morning I made further inquiry into the bill and the report of the committee and I have made some other investigations.

Briefly, this resolution makes in order House Resolution 207, reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee. House Resolution 207 authorizes the United States to join a new international organization, which is to take the place of UNRRA when that wholly discredited organization dies on June 30, 1947.

House Resolution 207 authorizes the appropriation of \$73,500,000 as the United States contribution, toward the operation of this new world organization, and it is intended to cover those countries where there are some 1,000,000 displaced persons; namely, in Austria, Germany, and Italy.

As I understand the report of the committee the same organization, the same set-up that is now administering the funds appropriated to UNRRA will take over and administer this with the exception that the United States will appoint a director.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will read the report and the hearings, the gentleman will find that UNRRA is not going to run this. UNRRA goes out of existence in 5 days, unwept, unhonored, and unsung. While some of the UNRRA personnel will have to be used in these camps, the direction of this is not coming from UNRRA.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman did not correct a thing I said. In fact, I stated precisely what the gentleman said, that the old UNRRA personnel now in the countries where these funds are to be expended will be used by the new organization to administer the funds requested here. The exception, as I just said, is that a new director will be named.

Here we are considering another authorization for \$73,500,000 for the purpose of feeding the displaced persons in these several countries.

In the War Department budget for 1947 there is an item of \$725,000,000 for the purpose of feeding those people within the zones we occupy, that is, Austria, Germany, Korea, Italy, and Japan.

A break-down of those figures as I got them from the Appropriations Committee is as follows: The amount allocated for the feeding of the people in Germany, and that includes the displaced persons in our zone, is \$308,814,760. There is another item of \$5,274,129 to feed the people in occupied Austria.

There is about \$210,000,000-plus in that budget request to pay the personnel in administering these funds. The rest of the \$725,000,000, of course, is allocated to Japan and Korea, but we are not interested in that in this debate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Yes; I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman will find that no provision of any kind is made in any of the War Department appropriations for the care and feeding of displaced persons at all after July 1st.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. That is what the gentleman told me the other day, so I took the matter up with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who I see on the floor, and who informed me—and I was so informed also by the clerk who gave me these figures—that this money was allocated for the purpose of feeding all people who may need food in our occupied territory; and, obviously, that includes that group of displaced persons.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25 contains a discussion of this subject in the other body during which Senator VANDENBERG made the statement that if this international relief organization was not authorized the Army would take over the program.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. If I remember correctly, when the bill was before the House authorizing \$350,000,000 for relief we were assured that because of the complete break-down and failure of UNRRA from now on we were going to take over this relief load ourselves.

We were asked to appropriate \$350,000,000 to take care of those people outside of the occupied zones and we were told that the War Department would take care of those within the zones. That is why I have brought out these figures represented in the budget request of the War Department to feed those people in the occupied zones. Of course, from our experience with UNRRA I would be reluctant to join any other world organization to which we contribute the greater part of the money; but the immediate assurance I seek here is that by authorizing this \$73,500,000 we would get a like credit from the budget request of the War Department.

Mr. VORYS. I can give no such assurance as my information is that in the budget which was filed and which is the basis for appropriation, this item of \$73,500,000 was included for the care of these displaced persons and the supervision of the camps and that no amount for that purpose is included in the military budget.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I refer the gentleman to the RECORD of March 25, page 2485. On that page Senator VANDENBERG makes this statement:

The International Refugee Organization will take over the responsibilities of the Army of the United States, heretofore and presently exercised; the responsibility of UNRRA, presently expiring; and the responsibilities of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. It will present a united, organized control of the displaced-persons problem in Germany, Austria, and Italy.

The question I would like to ask is this: We are concluding treaties with Austria and with Italy. Do we now proceed to take over the displaced persons problem in Austria and Italy after the treaties are signed with those countries?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If we adopt this resolution presented by the Committee on Foreign Affairs it would authorize this world organization to do that. There is no limitation placed upon our participation in this world organization except we may withdraw by giving 1 year's notice. I am not too much concerned about that. I would like to see the Army get out from under this tremendous load of feeding these different people. However, I am concerned about the duplication and the tremendous amount of money being asked for this purpose. The ink has no more than dried on bills we have already passed, authorizing \$400,000,000 in aid to Greece and Turkey, \$350,000,000 to feed the peoples of Europe who have been taken care of partially by UNRRA, and \$725,000,000 in the War Department budget, to say nothing of the tremendous sums we make available to the world through the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. Now comes this proposal for an added \$73,500,000. I must say to my colleagues there has to be a halt somewhere along the line. We all wish to contribute to the limit of our ability to relieve starvation and suffering. But I wonder if we are not going about this this in a wrong way.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to know if the gentleman has any information on the contributions made by other member nations to this fund?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Under this proposal?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If the gentleman will get the report and the hearings, he will find that. I cannot remember the number of countries that have already indicated their desire to participate in this. It is my recollection that

the United States will contribute something around 79 percent of the fund. The gentleman from Ohio can correct me if I am wrong about that.

Mr. VORYS. The United States contributes 39.89 percent for administrative expenses and 45.75 percent for operational expenses. If you care to look at the hearings, you will find on page 69 the budget and the contributions.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That would be a total contribution in percentage of the United States of about how much?

Mr. VORYS. Seventy-three million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The total fund is about how much?

Mr. VORYS. One hundred and sixty million dollars. If all of the countries do not come in, of course, our contribution would be proportionately larger. The largest it would be, however, would be about 55 percent. In no case would our contribution be increased. At present there are 19 countries that have signed the charter of the IRO. Six of them have come in without reservation. The rest, as with the United States, are subject to reservations. In our case the reservation, of course, is approval by the Congress.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. If we contribute 55 percent of the cost, will we have 55 percent of the control as to how the money is expended?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will have to refer that question to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. I will be glad to discuss the merits of this measure on the rule, if it is desired, although we had hoped to go into the details a little more fully in the Committee of the Whole. But the organization starts when it has 15 members and 75 percent of the budget subscribed. It will then have an executive committee consisting of nine. We would presumably be one of the nine. We would be one of the members, and it will have a director general who might or might not be an American. This is not a case, I take it, where we are seeking control and responsibility. It is a case where we now have control and responsibility of two-thirds of these people, 600,000 of them, in our zone, and we would be very happy to share control and responsibility with the rest of the world because this is not merely an American problem; it is an international problem, and I know of no one in the United States who is seeking to have us control the destiny of this organization or pay for all of its costs.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am very appreciative of the cooperation of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just felt that I ought to suggest that I am advised by soldiers from across the sea that they are drifting into our zone in these refugee camps

in droves just because they do not have to work there. In the British and the French zones, where they have these camps, they have to work. We make it more attractive to them by maintaining them in idleness. I do not know; maybe this international management would be better than our own, unless it degenerated into the same kind of international racketeering UNRRA was.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I said a few minutes ago that we should seek some assurance from the Committee on Appropriations that this fund is not going to be duplicated in the deficiency appropriation bill which involves \$750,000,000 for the War Department, to take care of the same people in the same areas. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. TABER. We have not finished our hearings. We have not had any hearings on this International Refugee Organization. We have not had complete hearings on the War Department bill and we have not had complete hearings on the \$350,000,000 deal, and no hearings at all on the \$400,000,000 for Greece. How I could give any assurance to anybody without complete hearings, is beyond me.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman that I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will give that assurance, because our committee has been given the assurance that there will be no duplication. While our committee does not handle appropriations any more than the Committee on Rules does, I am certainly counting on the Committee on Appropriations to make sure, with the assurances already given us by the administration, that there will be no duplication.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am quite sure the gentleman feels that way. I am glad to know that he is as much interested in that as I am.

Mr. VORYS. I certainly am.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman know whether this is considered an emergency measure or not?

Mr. VORYS. Could I answer that question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. UNRRA, as I say, goes out of existence on June 30. This organization which was set up last December 15 was contemplated to take over where UNRRA left off. UNRRA and the Army have been doing this job. I am informed that there are no appropriations available for the care of these people in the Army budget of July 1. There are no other provisions. Therefore there is a very difficult and embarrassing hiatus which will come along in 5 days from now, and we have seen the result of that in the papers in the past few days where the preparatory commission of IRO, which was not originally intended to be an operating organization, in order to bridge the gap and have some funds to keep these camps going and to take care of these people in the interim, is trying

to borrow \$1,000,000 from the United Nations.

Mr. BREHM. My purpose in asking this question was that if it is not an emergency, then I feel we should wait until the committee which has been appointed to study the situation comes in and reports to us just what our own economic situation is in America. If we have—and no doubt we have—previously committed ourselves, then of course, the only thing we can do is to go through with it. I have voted for each resolution and each appropriation requested for relief and rehabilitation purposes in devastated countries, and want to continue so to do, providing that such action does not jeopardize our own American economy. But I still maintain that we are obligating ourselves, committing ourselves, going forward with this program, and there is not a Member of this House at the present time who can tell us whether or not we can afford the program financially. Let us leave all the ideals out, because I am in sympathy with the ideals.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I prefer to let the gentleman debate that when we get into the committee.

Mr. BREHM. That was the reason for my question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I want to make just another observation or two and then relinquish the floor.

I am advised that it cost us \$130,000,000 last year to carry on this program. This bill reduces that amount substantially, because it calls for \$73,500,000. That may be accounted for because many of the displaced persons who were taken care of last year will no longer be in those zones. They may have been rehabilitated or gone somewhere else.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. We went in great detail into the question of reducing this expenditure to find why it could be reduced under IRO and could not be reduced under the United States Army. The reasons are fully disclosed in the record, and they are as follows: The IRO is an international organization that will operate on European standards. The estimate of the cost of management personnel alone, for example, by European standards is \$6,000,000 a year less than it would be according to the salaries we pay.

As was testified to us by General Hilldring, who was the State Department official concerned, a former general of the Army who had this thing in tow for years, we could not possibly run an operation on the austerity basis that an international organization can run it. He gave us another example, shoes. He said the United States Army shoes cost not less than twice as much for each of these refugees and DP's as this international organization will pay for them. Therefore, the difference in cost, which is extremely material, about 50 percent less, is accounted for by the fact that they will run the kind of a show that ought to be run on an austerity basis for these camps, which we could not possi-

bly do. This accounts for the difference in cost of about \$50,000,000 a year.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is another reason why, perhaps, the legislation is desirable. I am terribly disturbed about the tremendous drain upon our economy through these authorizations and appropriations. Out in the Midwest the newspapers are carrying stories today that on July 1 petroleum products and gasoline will be rationed, due in no small part to the fact that we have been shipping so much of our petroleum products out of the country. How much longer are we going to squander our wealth and resources without making some kind of an appraisal as to how far we can go? I think we ought to scrutinize every single one of these authorization bills with the greatest of care. I have all the confidence in the world in my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who assures me that by adopting this measure this country will save money. If we can do that without impairing the effectiveness of international relief, then, of course, it is a proper thing to do. If it is going to be an additional authorization, I think we should not pass it. I do hope you will adopt this rule and place the bill before the House for full debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it makes any of us happy to have to indulge in these large expenditures and this drain upon our Treasury and upon our taxpayers, but I do not think we can just look at this one particular item or this one particular bill. We have to look frankly at the world situation.

At the time the war ended there were 10,000,000 displaced persons in these camps in Europe. Fortunately, this number has now been reduced to about 1,000,000. Those people have been harassed, abused, and starved to the point where they are pitiable objects of human charity. Nobody in this country could turn his back upon the appeals those people make to the Christian charity of civilized people.

The only question that is presented to us today, it seems to me, is whether we are going to let these people starve to death. They have no place to go. They cannot go back to the countries from which they came. That has not been our policy. We have spent many hundreds of millions of dollars. By doing so we have kept thousands of these poor outcasts from actual starvation.

My friend from Indiana has one fear about this bill, that it will be duplicated in the appropriation for the War Department. I am surprised he does not know the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, better than that. If the Committee on Appropriations ever duplicates this fund, it will be a great surprise to me. I have absolute faith that they are not going to spend any more money than they have to. This is just one of those necessities growing out of the war, to try to alleviate the chaos of Europe in order that we may not get in a worse fix over there than we are now.

It seems to me to be an expenditure that we just have to make, and one that we ought to make, and one that has every appeal to the charitable instincts of the American people.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I find, on page 11 in the report of the committee, a statement by General Hilldring, who is now Assistant Secretary of State and was formerly a general in the War Department, in which he says:

I wish to emphasize our contribution to IRO would be in lieu of and make unnecessary those expenditures which would otherwise be made by the War Department or other agencies of our Government for displaced-persons operations which are the responsibility of the Government of the United States.

Obviously, when they made up their budget of \$725,000,000 and sent it here to the Committee on Appropriations, they did not know if the Congress was going to authorize this \$73,500,000 and they covered it with the War Department so that they would have the money in case. I want to emphasize that fact and I want the Committee on Appropriations to know that if we do authorize this \$73,500,000 they should look the budget over very carefully.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman from Indiana has the same confidence in the Committee on Appropriations as I have heretofore expressed. They are not going to appropriate or recommend the appropriation of any money that is not necessary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the gentleman has had any concern about the immigration of these people to the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is expressly taken care of in the language of the bill. If the gentleman will read the bill he will find that it has no effect whatsoever on our immigration laws and it authorizes the immigration of no one into this country.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield further at that point, I do not know whether he has read the constitution of the Refugee Organization.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have read the bill, and the bill is what is going to govern us in this instance.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, but the constitution provides for the immigration to other countries.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is not our Constitution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But it is in their constitution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. In response to the question that naturally might be raised as to what might be the effect of this bill on immigration, in the constitution of IRO they do three things for the displaced persons, that is, for these refugees. They take care of their support

and their repatriation, that is, sending them home where they can be sent home for resettlement or in other countries. Many countries are accepting them. However, if you will look at the first page of the bill you will find set forth in the shortest way that this can be stated the Revercomb amendment which was put into this bill in another body and is adopted in this legislation. The language is as follows:

Provided, however, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

You cannot say that any more plainly than that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will permit me to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question, if he has read the constitution set up by the organization it does provide for the immigration to other countries.

Mr. VORYS. Certainly. I just said that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the bill takes care of it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the bill takes care of it, it is true, but the constitution provides for it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is here as an aftermath of the war. We join with other nations in taking care of the displaced persons in the American zone in Europe. There are some 1,000,000 that have no place to go. They are the direct responsibility of the victorious nations. They must be fed. The problem is to find a home for them and make them self-supporting just as soon as possible.

I, like many Members of Congress, have been greatly displeased at the operation and results of UNRRA. It is not a pretty picture and one we would like to forget.

It is to be hoped that this activity of caring for the displaced persons will go forward with efficiency and that there will be no duplication in the work now being carried on by the Army.

The Congress will without doubt be called upon for several years to make appropriations for this type of work. This is not the last effort in assisting these people.

I also hope that a survey can be made of our resources in order to determine just how much assistance can be given all over the world by the United States. I have been of the opinion for some time that we are now overextending ourselves, and that it will result in a serious disloca-

tion of our own economy if long continued. There is a definite limit as to what we can do. This refugee problem is but a small segment of the entire picture.

As this resolution is passed and the work starts, I hope there will be careful supervision and reports of the results to the Congress. If it develops that there are abuses, as in UNRRA, the next Congress will be very reluctant to continue the program under a joint arrangement with 20 other nations. I do feel that inasmuch as we must furnish most of the funds, that we should exercise more authority and have the responsibility of seeing that the program is operated in an efficient manner. This may be hard to do with so many conflicting ideas from 20 other nations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. I think there should be no misunderstanding on the question of immigration. It has nothing in the world to do with this bill, and the bill expressly says so. It does not make any difference what the constitution of the United Nations says or the constitution of any other country or organization in Europe says. The only way people can come into this country is through a modification or change of the law of our country by an act of Congress. This bill expressly excludes that subject from its provisions and there is simply no question about that and everybody is agreed upon it.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to its adoption or rejection.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 125

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 125.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 207 with Mr. BREHM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], for 30 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been rather well explained through the questioning during the consideration of the rule; but let me just summarize what this legislation provides.

The bill under consideration provides for our joining an international organization for the care, repatriation, and resettlement of displaced persons called the International Refugee Organization, which was formed on December 15, 1946, and goes into effect when 15 nations have joined without reservation and when 75 percent of the budget has been subscribed. It was contemplated that the United States would have joined a long time ago and that was the reason why no arrangement was made for taking care of these people further in the military budgets. A companion bill to this one passed the Senate unanimously on March 25. This bill required some rewriting to provide for the interim period between July 1, when UNRRA winds up, and when appropriations for the care and supervision of these camps under the Army winds up; these interim provisions take up the latter part of this legislation, which is a very short resolution.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. Is there anything in this bill that will preclude this organization from circumventing directly or indirectly the immigration laws of the country?

Mr. VORYS. I am sorry the gentleman was not here when I read section 1. If the gentleman will look at page 1, line 9, continuing to line 16 on page 2, the gentleman will find the most thoroughgoing elimination of any possibility that this organization or our joining it could make any change whatsoever in our immigration laws.

As the gentleman knows, there is a bill before his committee which has to do with proposed immigration of these DP's.

This bill very carefully and explicitly has nothing to do with that and provides that our joining this organization shall not change in any respect our immigration laws.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. Is the language cited by the gentleman in substance the Revercomb amendment to the Senate bill?

Mr. VORYS. It is exactly the Revercomb amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is Russia a part of this organization?

Mr. VORYS. Russia has been invited to join and has not joined, nor have any of the so-called satellite countries. While, of course, no one can read the future, it is not expected that Russia will join. Russia has its own solution for the DP's problem.

Mr. DONDERO. One more question. Does this relieve the army of occupation of some of the burdens they are now carrying?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; it does. If you will read what General Hildring said, who handled this for the Army, and what Secretary Petersen had to say on it, it is a relief which they devoutly hope will come soon. They say this is not a military problem, it is a civilian problem, and they ought to be out of it. They further say this is not just an American problem but an international problem and an international organization should have responsibility and control.

Mr. DONDERO. With that in mind, might this resolution then save this country some money?

Mr. VORYS. This resolution will save \$58,500,000 over what it cost us for this purpose during the current year. The gentleman will find on page 33 of the hearings the estimated cost if we do not go into IRO, which will be over \$20,000,000 more than if we do go in.

Mr. DONDERO. It is for that reason I look with favor upon this resolution.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it correct that this does not include but excludes people of Germanic origin, whether they come from any other country into Germany or are in Germany?

Mr. VORYS. This excludes the so-called ethnic Germans. There has been criticism of that exclusion and the gentleman will find in the hearings on page 51 a statement from the Refugee's Defense Committee, an organization which feels they should not be excluded. Let me remind the gentleman, however, that IRO is an international organization, and as the Refugee's Defense Committee pointed out in their statement, it is not within the power of the Congress of the United States to amend the constitution of an international organization.

Our representative at the first meeting of IRO will be the Hon. Lewis Douglas, our Ambassador to Britain, who many will remember when he was a Member of this House and who can be depended upon to represent this country wisely and well. He can propose an amendment to include ethnic Germans, but when it is considered there are millions of those

people, that they are in there among their own countrymen in Germany, it seems to me it is asking a good bit for the rest of the world to take on that burden in addition to this million of the DP's the Germans brought in as slaves and as political prisoners, from other countries.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. These ethnic Germans we are now speaking of fall exclusively on the shoulders of the United States Army so far as their support now is concerned?

Mr. VORYS. No; they fall upon Germany. They may be a part of our general burden in our zone.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was interested in the definition of "persons of German ethnic origin" and in checking the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find this definition of persons of German ethnic origin:

1. Pertaining to the Gentiles, or to nations not converted to Christianity; heathen; pagan—opposed to Jewish and Christian.

2. Relating to community of physical and mental traits in races, or designating groups of races of mankind discriminated on the basis of common customs and characters.

I think they should have said ex-enemy Germans. Who can say whether a man is a Christian or not?

Mr. VORYS. I do not know whether the gentleman is reading from the charter of the IRO or not, but the charter does set forth in full a definition.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But ethnic Germans are excluded?

Mr. VORYS. They are excluded from IRO.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I read to the gentleman the definition taken from Webster's Dictionary on what an ethnic German is.

Mr. VORYS. I am advised from a reading of the provisions of the charter on page 68 of the hearings which explains what ethnic German means in this connection that no such definition as you read is included.

Let me remind you all what this is all about. When our armies overran Europe in 1945 there were about 8,000,000 of these slaves and political prisoners in concentration camps and in slave camps. They were then called displaced persons, or DP's. They were the victims of Hitler's fiendish cruelty. With my colleagues the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], whom I see here today, I was on a congressional committee requested by General Eisenhower to go and see the concentration camps as they were opened up. I brought here today a couple of photographs of what those camps looked like when we got there. These people at Buchenwald, Nordhausen, and Dachau had been the victims of the most diabolical and fiendish cruelty that was ever practiced on this planet. Those who were left were on our hands. It shocked me over 2 years ago to find that American soldiers were still holding these people in the concentration camps because they were so infected with typhus and

other diseases that they would not let them out, fearing they would contaminate the surrounding Germans and our own troops. It is a shock to me to think that any of these people are still left in these camps, but such is the fact. However, 7,000,000 out of the 8,000,000 have already been repatriated or returned to their homes, and the problem here is what to do with what is called the hard core of unrepatriables, those who cannot go home for obvious reasons, because to go home means to go to slavery or death.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Let me call your attention to page 2 of the report and see how this remaining group is made up. In camps there are 278,868 Poles. They cannot go home. Jewish, 193,332. They cannot go home. Balts, 180,838. Yugoslavs, 34,494. Soviets, 13,800. You can see that practically all of these people do not dare go home. They are scattered in about 700 camps ranging from a few hundred up to 16,000.

The purpose of this organization, as mentioned before, is to take care of them where they are; to repatriate such as can be repatriated, and to resettle as many as possible. Resettlement is going on at a rate which is estimated to reach 150,000 or better this year, so that this problem will dwindle, and it is hoped that it will only last for 2 or 3 years. No one knows how long it will last. If there are changes in the political situation there, maybe many of these people can go home, but at the present time they are a charge on us. We have got two-thirds of them on the American taxpayers, and it seems to me that it would be wise for us to move back and let other nations share in this responsibility. We do not desire to control the destinies of these people. We are perfectly willing to have a proper international organization take over.

Now, the question was raised as to whether this is going to be an UNRRA show. As I have stated, we have definite assurance that it will not be. As is pointed out in the report, we have assurances from General Marshall, and we know from the appointment of a man like Lew Douglas that it will not be run on an UNRRA basis if he has anything to say about it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to ask the gentleman just what voice or what vote do we have in this international organization.

Mr. VORYS. We just get one vote.

Mr. O'HARA. How many votes are there in the organization?

Mr. VORYS. There are 19 who have joined as we have, 13 subject to reservations. For instance, our reservation is that Congress must act. Six have joined and paid in their shares. It is fully set forth here. We only get one vote. But this is not, as I said earlier, a case where I think America is seeking control or domination of the organization. It is an international matter, where we have got

a little too much control and responsibility right now and we would be very happy to share the control and responsibility with others.

May I say this: We have the most profound and definite assurance as to the type of person who will be chosen to head this organization. You can find the assurance in writing from General Marshall in the hearings, page 43, but, in addition, we have other assurances. Of course, any discussion of who would head an organization that we have not as yet joined would not only be premature, but embarrassing and impertinent, so no such discussion can be entered into. But, we have the profoundest assurance that the leadership in this organization is going to be businesslike and realistic.

Let me say just one last word. I have discussed the financial aspects showing how we can save money by going into this. But let us not forget this that this million of men, women, and children—and there are children being born in these camps—are suffering in body and in spirit because, through no fault of their own, they cannot get to the place that is dearest to us all—home, and while we discuss this as an economic problem, as we should, let us bear in mind also that we are dealing with some human beings who have suffered greatly.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to inquire if our share of contribution in this organization is based upon our share of contribution in UNRRA.

Mr. VORYS. No. Our share in this is 39.89 percent for administrative and 45.75 percent for operating. You cannot proportion that to anything except that they got around the table and they got up what they thought would be a fair proportion for each prospective member, and the gentleman will find that in the hearings on page 69.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Will the personnel that have been in UNRRA be turned over to this new organization and be employed by the new organization?

Mr. VORYS. We discuss that in our report. I think I can best answer it by reading this sentence:

We believe, however, from the assurances we have received, and the character of our representation in the IRO that the leadership and direction of IRO will not contain any UNRRA personnel, and that the only UNRRA people who will come into IRO will be certain operating personnel on the working level, who have proven their competence under trying circumstances.

We must remember two things: One, UNRRA is going out unwept, unhonored, and unsung as far as Congress is concerned. Two, the only people on earth who have experience in directing these camps are some UNRRA people, and there are some good ones. You will find in the report the letter from General Marshall which shows the way in which they are processing the ones that will be taken over, but UNRRA's personnel will not furnish the leadership.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. They have gone over with practically double the salaries of the last 5 months.

Mr. VORYS. I do not know about that.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill with the Revercomb amendment in it, because I think that problem has to be dealt with. To keep the RECORD straight, however, I want to say that my good friend who has just left the floor has been misinformed to a great extent and has allowed his enthusiasm to run away with him. He intimates that 800,000 refugees or displaced persons now in the some 300 American camps, were there at the time he went over and surveyed the horrors and the tragedies of the concentration camps. That is not true. Probably less than 30 percent of those now in the DP camps were displaced persons at the time the shooting ended. Many of them have voluntarily displaced themselves since that time. They came into the American zone and have just stayed. True, it is a problem, and they are on our hands, but they are not the persecuted, oppressed people that some would have you believe them to be.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] states that they are nonrepatriable. That, too, is a great exaggeration. Gen. Lowell W. Rooks, currently head of UNRRA, made the statement the other day that of the 7,000,000 persons repatriated by the Allied forces following the war there was no one single authenticated case on record where any of them had been liquidated or persecuted. Most of these people just refuse to go home. Many of them could find useful occupations, they could serve with credit and helpfulness to the devastated areas from whence they came, if they would. Most of those remaining in these camps are human wreckage, many are bums and criminals.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There are 242,669 that have jobs outside the camps now. If these people can get jobs in hostile Germany, it seems to me they show a good bit of ingenuity, but they are hanging onto their DP status because they want to get out of Germany.

Mr. GOSSETT. Those are very minor jobs. As a matter of fact, we won the war, and we can settle those people in Germany if we want to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman does not mean to say that all the people who went back to these other countries were not persecuted and killed, because if the gentleman wants specific cases I can give him specific cases of hundreds of people who went back to their own countries and when they got back there were liquidated right away.

Mr. GOSSETT. I was quoting what General Rooks said as reproduced in the

Christian Science Monitor on the 4th day of this month. None of the witnesses appearing before our committee now having hearings on the so-called Stratton bill—and I have asked several of them that question—have produced any cases. There are persons being liquidated in areas of Europe, it is true, but they are not necessarily the people who went from these DP camps back home.

Mr. BLOOM. But they were displaced persons back in their own countries.

Mr. GOSSETT. No; they were people who had lived there for generations, many of them.

There is another angle of this thing I want to call to the attention of the House before passing on. I say the first thing the IRO ought to do is close up those camps and send those back home who will go. As for those who will not go, let them stand in the soup lines, if necessary, with others whom it may be necessary to feed. To be a displaced person in the American zone is to be in a preferred status, and we have more or less invited it. Why treat these folks better than others. They are not a particular problem of ours. That is why I am willing for the UN to deal with the matter. I am not willing, however, for them to dump these undesirables into our lap or to settle them in this country. I will support this bill in reliance upon the good faith enforcement of the Revercomb amendment.

Another misstatement that is generally made is that these people are in concentration camps and that we maintain confines. That is not true at all. We have not done that in a long while. They are free to go and come as they will. Incidentally, many of them are making pretty good money on black-market operations out of American goods which we furnish them. That sort of thing ought to be looked into.

Now, about the personnel in this IRO. You have one very objectionable gentleman up there now who is working as an American in the refugee organization. I have a long record here, part of which was compiled by the FBI, which indicates that this man is a notorious Communist. I might not be able to praise his communism, but I do know that he came here in 1940 under the Spanish quota. He worked for the State Department for a while. He was fired down there. His name is Gustavo Duran. He is now a social-affairs officer in the social department of the Refugee Division of the United Nations. He is at present serving in that capacity at an annual salary of \$7,500 a year. If he is the Duran I think him to be, he would be hanged in Spain. Even if he be some other Duran, why place a recent Spanish immigrant in such a position of authority? This is a time when none but Americans should be on guard. While I assume this Gustavo Duran is still employed in the Refugee Division of United Nations, and I further assume he would be so employed by the IRO when set up.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I would like to be enlightened if I am wrong. The only IRO

personnel on this planet at the present time that there could possibly be would be those connected with the IRO preparatory commission in Geneva. I know of no other IRO organization in the world, because the thing has not started yet and cannot get started officially because not enough people have joined and, frankly, many nations are waiting to see what we do.

Mr. GOSSETT. But this is the nucleus of what we are hoping will grow into the IRO. This man is the social officer in the social department of the Refugee Division of the United Nations. Now, I say that he has no business there, and if those are the sort of folks who are going to run this thing then it is going to be a pipe line for Communists to come into this country as well as a lot of other people that we do not want.

Mr. VORYS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOSSETT. I want to caution those of you who have worked so diligently on this thing that you look into the sort of folks who are going to run it. Further, do not be misled by a lot of propaganda about the people who are now in the displaced-person camps.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it seems quite well agreed here today that the United States should accept membership in the International Refugee Organization. I want to sum up, so that we are quite clear, why we on the committee came to that conclusion and why I believe the House should come to that conclusion.

First and foremost, the refugee and DP camps in the occupied areas of Germany, Austria, and Italy today are being operated under the United States flag and under the command of United States Army personnel. If all of you could have sat with us and heard how the Army considers that job burdensome and interfering with its primary responsibilities, and with great justice, you would be more sympathetic to this way out for the Army and for the United States itself.

Second, we cannot possibly conduct an operation in a way that Europeans conduct an operation. They conduct it on the basis of a cost which we just cannot begin to duplicate. We questioned the witnesses very closely on that score and came to two conclusions. First, that it is actually costing us \$130,000,000 a year to take care of the DP camps under our direct jurisdiction in which two-thirds of the DP's are now located. Under the IRO plan which we have here it will cost us \$73,500,000, which is a very material saving of well in excess of \$50,000,000. Not satisfied with that comparison, we insisted that the Army construct a budget based on the very same austerity basis which the IRO will use in the administration of these camps. The construction of that budget is found in the record of the committee hearings on page 33. On that very same austerity basis the Army said they could not possibly run the operation for less than \$94,000,000 a year.

So, no matter what basis you take it on, there is a very material saving financially to the United States. That is point two.

Finally, we transfer our responsibility here to an international organization with which we now deal at arms' length. That is a very important consideration, especially as it bears on the issue of immigration, which, as it did in the other body, has come under considerable discussion and consideration in the House here.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I am curious as to what authority the organization has. Suppose by a majority vote they agree to move some of these people from Germany to France. Do they have any authority to do so without the consent of France, for example?

Mr. JAVITS. No; it does not. It depends upon the national processes of each of the countries involved. The International Refugee Organization will be compelled to deal at arm's length with us and with every other country concerned, although that country may be a member of the organization; and that brings me to the point of immigration. I do not think I need impress upon the House my deep interest in this whole question of resettling the refugees and DP's by immigration into various countries. I want to assure the House that there is no moral basis arising out of this legislation which will give any better or different claim to whatever efforts are being made to get the United States to take some of these refugees and DP's under our immigration laws. No different, or stronger, or better moral basis is being created by this legislation whatsoever. On the contrary, the organization of the International Refugee Organization will divest our Army of responsibility for the refugees and DP's and relieve us of the pressure which would come from the Army's desire otherwise to divest itself of this jurisdiction. The passage of this legislation clears the atmosphere for an opportunity to debate the immigration issue directly between the various people who have different ideas on the subject. We in the United States will deal, then, at arm's length with an international organization which will have the whole matter in charge.

I think that every argument that can be made regarding this matter is covered in the committee hearings. The committee went into it very thoroughly and very exhaustively, taking an initial responsibility as if it had not been heard by the Senate at all. The committee came to the unanimous conclusion that membership in the International Refugee Organization was the best way to handle the situation.

I hope the House will pass the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman investigated the thousands of packages being sent to this

country from Greece supposedly for the starving Americans?

Mr. JAVITS. There are two explanations. I have a great many people of Greek extraction in my district. I find that one explanation is the feeling of gratitude in Greece and their desire to send some delicacies over here in friendly reciprocity. That bounteous feeling apparently has been traded on by some organizations having their bases both in Greece and the United States, stirring the people up to send these packages over, carriage charges collect. As a result it becomes a money-making scheme. The thing is being investigated very much more thoroughly, but from what we now know that is what it looks like; it looks like some activity perpetrated upon these already poor and desperate people of Greece.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have already introduced two resolutions to take care of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present. This is too important legislation to be considered when so few Members are on the floor.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BREHM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein a communication by Vicente Villamin.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, for 2 days, on account of business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MOVEMENT OF FOOD PARCELS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, arose on this floor and said, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an Associated Press item appearing in a Washington paper, which says that a mysterious movement of thousands of food parcels to the United States from the deluded people of the Mediterranean area, themselves hungry, has been in progress for months, with the shipments apparently designed for supposedly starving American relatives and friends. These people, the article continues, must be the victims of an unfriendly ideology whose followers are spreading propaganda on the bad state of affairs in America.

Mr. Speaker, I still quote the gentleman from Tennessee. He said:

In other words, Moscow, by press, radio, and otherwise, is telling the people of the Balkan and Mediterranean countries that our Government has fallen, that we are in a state of chaos and revolution and that our people are starving.

It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Tennessee, who is known to be one of the most astute members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is puzzled at the idea of the starving people of the Balkan countries actually shipping food to their kinfolk and friends here in America, and perhaps today I can unravel the mystery. Those things which I am about to say, Mr. Speaker, should be construed as a message to all of the Americans of Slavish descent, and to all the Canadian people of Slavish descent, and to all the Slavs in either the United States or the Dominion of Canada.

For the past 18 months there has been considerable action amongst American and Canadian Slavs, particularly those citizens of either country who were born in Slavish countries and who during their years on this continent have acquired a modest stake, and are either at or are approaching the period of their retirement. The action amongst these people, I have discovered, is by agents and representatives of the various Slavish countries now behind the ominous Russian iron curtain. It is now known that a great effort, for many, many months, has been made to convince those who have some money, that things are now good back in Europe and every appeal is made to the very human desire of every person to see the hills and streams of his native land before he dies.

I have discovered that many Slavs, particularly Croats and Serbs, have already shipped back to Yugoslavia, usually accompanied by their wife and what children they can induce to go along, in the belief that they were going back to a peaceful, settled land where there was a minimum of political troubles, and sufficient food, and the other necessities of life, to keep every person contented. This idea has been drummed into these people in Canada and the United States to such an extent that several boat loads of them have already disappeared behind the iron curtain, and it is my fear that they have disappeared forever.

The gentleman from Tennessee is much puzzled that packages of food should be

arriving from Balkan countries supposedly for starving Americans, and expresses the belief that some person is supplying the people of the Balkans with misinformation about the United States, where we still have plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and almost every other thing that humans desire these days. Let me inform the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COURTNEY, and let me inform the Slavish people of the United States and Canada what is actually going on, and may I preface this remark by saying that although I represent a district in western Pennsylvania, and as everybody knows there are hundreds of thousands of citizens of Slavish descent in western Pennsylvania, there are so few of them in my own district that no check has ever been made to determine their numbers, thus there is no politics in what I say; but there is a sincere desire to save thousands of the good Slavish citizens of North America from the horrible, bloody disillusion that awaits them if they make the mistake of leaving these shores.

I should be specific and say that my message today is directed principally to former citizens of Yugoslavia, Serbs, Croats, and Albanians, to Bulgars, to Latvians, to Czechs, Slovenes, Russians, and Poles, and to the non-Slavic countries—Rumania, Hungary, and Greece. Those packages of food coming back here are all a part of a dastardly lie on the part of the Communist dictators in Moscow who are teaching the illiterate people in the Balkans that the American Government has fallen and the American people are in chaos and that food has become a desperate necessity here in America. Let me tell the Congress something, and the Slavs of the United States and Canada. There is a movement of Slavs out of Canada to Yugoslavia. Every inducement is made by Communist agents to accelerate this movement. The Communists have several objectives—one is to immediately steal what money these people have taken with them, and another is to prove to the people back home, by the arrival of many American Slavs, that conditions here are so awful that they were glad to escape. A third reason is to get the children both in the United States and Canada, and who are citizens of both countries, who are now between, say, 9 and 15 years old, into cleverly organized Communist schools in Russia, that they may come back here in a few years as American citizens and Canadian citizens, and a fourth reason, and an all-important reason for this attempted mass exodus of Slavs, is to give the Communist agents who arranged this the opportunity to get into their possession as many American and Canadian passports as possible. The now-famous Gerhart Eisler case demonstrates what can be done in America with such documents as these.

Let me read you a wire received from the steamship *Radnik*, which very recently arrived at the port of Split on the Dalmatian coast, which is a part of Yugoslavia:

The first day after leaving Montreal the Communist commissar of the ship informed all passengers that they must deliver their money into his hands. This money, he said,

would be returned to them on their arrival in Yugoslavia. The commissar told these people that the reason for collecting their money was because of their sleeping arrangements there might be burglaries aboard.

The disillusioned Slavs aboard the *Radnik* made such a strenuous objection to this mass theft that the commissar and other Communist agents aboard the ship made a forced search of their baggage. This resulted in arguments, quarrels, and fights and resulted in the death of one of the men named Jakov Drobnic, a Slovene from Toronto who was buried before the ship got out of the St. Lawrence River, at Father Point, Quebec. This man's wife and two children are now in Yugoslavia and a son is living in Noranda, Canada. They were robbed before they even left the sound of traffic on the Canadian shore.

On an earlier voyage, the *Radnik* took a load of passengers from Vancouver in British Columbia. It picked up some more at San Pedro, Calif., picked up some more at Marseilles, France, and they all disappeared behind the hammer and the sickle on the Dalmatian coast. No Congressman, nor the State Department, nor anybody else, can get these American and Canadian citizens back to the safety of America, as the Communist dictator, Josip Broz, known to the world as Tito, insists they every person born in Yugoslavia is always a citizen of that country, and recognizes no demands for them.

Mr. Speaker, may I reveal something else that should be interesting, not only to the Slavs of the New World but to all citizens of all decent countries all over the world. Here is the story of what happens when Red fascism overcomes a free country. Yugoslavia, like all other lands, is a land of homes and families, otherwise it would not be a country but merely a desert of wandering folk much like the Sahara, but for generations and centuries the hills of Albania, Croatia, and Serbia have been populated with homes and all the things that make for a country. Here is what happened in Yugoslavia—Tito, after years of training in Moscow, and after General Mihailovich was sold out by the British and American Governments, became the dictator of Yugoslavia. He made only a few laws, and, taken separately, those laws appear not to be too bad, but collectively they have destroyed the home life and the family life of this country, and are rapidly creating a generation of children whose only paternity is the State, which means Tito. For instance, Mr. Speaker, Tito said that the penalty for the oldest and most common crime in the world—adultery—would be death, and in subsequent months people were executed in various parts of Yugoslavia charged with adultery. He also declared that all children are born legal—that there is no such thing as illegitimate, and that every mother was by law required to be responsible for a child. He removed from men any responsibility for fatherhood at all. Then a third edict was that divorce is merely a matter of routine. A divorce could be granted on any cause whatsoever—merely the desire. With the awful penalty of death hanging over the heads of young people

of Yugoslavia, hundreds of thousands of marriages occurred, and subsequently hundreds of thousands of divorces occurred, until within a period of 3 years hundreds of thousands of girls had been married numerous times, had children by various fathers, and these children now are wards of the State. Do not you see what has happened in Yugoslavia? This country of peasants, whose mainstay was the home and the fireside, and who were intensely religious—religion has gone, all knowledge of home life is gone, and a new and dangerous generation is rapidly being created there.

Can you imagine the results of such laws—laws that affect birth and death and everything else that is fundamental to human being? By the time the young people of Yugoslavia reach the age where they desire a more settled and a more sedate life, they discover that is not to be. The girls have been married many times and have many children. The only thing to turn to, either for the men or the women and children, is to the state; thus, these ruthless antireligious Communists destroy civilization in one generation.

The number of Members of the House and the Senate who bear Slavic names or who have Slav blood in their veins is a daily living testimony to the great things the Slavish people have brought to America. The history of the United States, beginning with the very battlefields of the Revolution, contains the names of Poles and Czechs and other Slavs—many of them—who risked their lives, and many died in their wild desire for freedom—freedom for America, if they could not have it in their own country.

Mr. Speaker, many American Slavs are being urged to visit Canada and then urged to get aboard these ships and sail without proper passports or visas. Even their visiting papers are eagerly sought after by the agents of the Comintern.

These things that I have related here, dismal as they are, I believe to be true, as I have checked the source of my information in many ways and in many directions. This information has come to me through my work on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For the safety of those who furnished the information I will not reveal their names, but one day I will, and it will be seen that the people who told me these things and placed the proof in my hands are as familiar with the countries named here as I am with my own beloved Pennsylvania.

I hope the Slavs of America will read these remarks and ponder about their future.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

MOVEMENT OF FOOD PARCELS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced two similar resolutions; one requests information of the Secretary of State and the other requests information of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession relative to reports published in the New York Times and other newspapers that thousands of packages containing 100,000 to 160,000 pounds of food, mostly meat, have been shipped during the past 6 to 12 months from Greece and the Mediterranean area to the United States for supposedly starving Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a second similar resolution asking that the Secretary of the Treasury submit to the House the same information, as the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs has much information in the matter.

This is a serious situation and should not be permitted to go unnoticed or unexplained by the Government departments. With the billions of dollars and commodities of all kinds being sent to Europe by this country, something is very definitely wrong to have a situation of this kind exist. The United States Department of Agriculture undoubtedly brought the matter out into the light when the Bureau of Animal Industry apparently traced an outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease to 1,539 cases of foodstuffs which arrived here on the S. S. *Examiner* last November. Mark Etheridge, United States representative of the United Nations' Balkan Commission, said the shipment of food parcels from Greece to the United States "sounds like a first-class racket." The Greek Government officials have cabled the Greek consular officials in the United States for full details of the shipments. I hope very much that the Members of the House will cooperate in securing the adoption of my resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, this strange situation should be immediately and very thoroughly investigated. We are sending supplies to the starving people of Greece and other countries in the Mediterranean area, and certainly they should not be sending back supplies to us. Whether this is out of the kindness of their hearts or just a racket, nobody seems to know.

Reference has been made to the outbreak of the hoof-and-mouth disease, which has been traced to 1,539 cases of foodstuffs which arrived on the steamship *Examiner* last November. Something is radically wrong if we are sending food to the starving people of Europe, and they, in turn, because they think we are starving, send it back to us. This situation should be investigated completely before we go very much further with what we are doing. The situation shows an inadequate information department or an inadequate intelligence department.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this time to say to the House that the amputees and the disabled veterans cannot understand why they are getting no legislation during this session of the Congress when millions and millions of dollars are being sent to foreign countries. The disabled veterans have no feeling against the people of foreign countries, but they do have a feeling against sending money over there, and when they ask for help they are told it is time to economize. Economy should not be at the expense of

the disabled. It is high time that the money going to these other countries be used for the disabled if they are to be cared for. The disabled are extremely tender-hearted and generous, and every country has had examples of their great generosity. But our disabled need help.

I refer to one piece of legislation having to do with the amputees and the blind, which expires on the 30th of June. Many of them are in hospitals and cannot take advantage of the legislation. For many, it is their only means of transportation. If this legislation expires, it means that their ability to get around will be lost. It means loss of a chance for a job or a chance for school or college. Can you picture a man without legs, a man without arms, and you see him in an automobile; you do not know whether he has any legs or not, you do not realize whether he has arms or not; but if you see him get out of that car, you will realize what it has meant to that man, who has given half of himself, to have a means of transportation in order that he may live a fairly normal life, in order that he may be able to get work. No one would want to deny him this opportunity. This is a rehabilitation measure. Some of the doctors who opposed the measure last year, when the boys had taken it up with me, are for it this year. They have made a further study of the matter, and they believe that it is a real rehabilitation for these men. The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, introduced a much better piece of legislation than the one last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleading with the House to pass his bill, H. R. 3583, which was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and is now before the Rules Committee. I plead that this legislation be passed before the time expires, preferably tomorrow. Pass the bill before it is too late.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy; and

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

850. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting an amendment to a draft of a proposed bill which was submitted on April 22, 1947, entitled "A bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

851. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$100,000, for the Department of the Interior, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3810. A bill to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3961. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1113. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1938. A bill to authorize the appropriation, for expenditure by the International Children's Fund of the United Nations Organization, of certain amounts received from services of conscientious objectors; with an amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3395. A bill to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3614. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial; with an amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2956. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2225. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort McIntosh at Laredo, Tex., and certain personal property in connection therewith, without ex-

change of funds or reimbursement; without amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1426. A bill to extend veterans-preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen; with amendments (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 156. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the launching of the U. S. S. Constitution; without amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3759. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3501. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3851. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 775. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3969. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3970. A bill to establish standards for education in the Constitution and American history for the District of Columbia, to provide for obtaining factual information by the Congress of teaching methods in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3971. A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3972. A bill to transfer certain functions and personnel to the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3973. A bill relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 3974. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to acquire home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3975. A bill to authorize the appointment as officers in the Regular Establishments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of enlisted men who served as officers under combat conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3976. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 3977. A bill to direct the Civil Service Commission to confer a competitive classified civil-service status upon certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3978. A bill to provide for the temporary advancement in rank and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia serving as supervisors of certain squads; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3979. A bill to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of National Security; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Forces; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security (short title: National Security Act of 1947); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3980. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures; to alter or modify their financial securities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 3981. A bill providing for the sale of the Trask Homes housing project in Tillamook, Oreg.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 257. A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to food and meat being shipped from Greece and the Mediterranean area to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 258. A resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to food and meat being shipped from Greece and the Mediterranean area to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 259. A resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3982. A bill to provide for the readmission to citizenship of Hua-Chuen Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 3984. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3985. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

678. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of Royal Oak, Mich., petitioning Congress to prevent the cutting down of the trees in the Olympic Forest by individuals or corporations for commercial uses and urging adverse action on Senate bill 711, House bills 2750 and 2751, and House Joint Resolution 44; to the Committee on Public Lands.

679. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by Auxiliaries of the United Spanish War Veterans of Wisconsin, protesting entrance of 250,000 displaced persons into our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

680. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 200 members of St. Luke's Archconfraternity, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation of conditions in Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

681. Also, petition of A. M. Corbett and sundry other citizens of West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

682. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and sundry other citizens of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

683. Also, petition of Miss Anna L. Stark and sundry other citizens of Sarasota, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

684. Also, petition of members of Loyalty Council No. 55, a subordinate council, representatives of the Daughters of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bills 35, 36, 37, 38, 464, 466, 1249, 1250, and 1251; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we are beginning to understand at last that the things that are wrong with our world are the sum total

of all the things that are wrong with us as individuals. Thou hast made us after Thine image, and our hearts can find no rest until they rest in Thee.

We are too Christian really to enjoy sinning and too fond of sinning really to enjoy Christianity. Most of us know perfectly well what we ought to do; our trouble is that we do not want to do it. Thy help is our only hope. Make us want to do what is right, and give us the ability to do it.

In the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, June 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 25, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of

enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games; and

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3342. An act to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies;

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy, or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as